It is to be hoped that this book will be circulated and studied widely among all Muslims engaged in daʿwah, dialogue, education and research, and seen as a truly essential tool. For Muslims, this is easily the most important book of recent times.

– Murad Wilfried Hofmann, *The Muslim World Book Review*

Professor Azami's book constitutes a major contribution to Qur'anic studies in English ... The result is superb.

– Adil Salahi, *Impact International*

The Qur'ān reigns supreme in Muslim hearts as the most sacred of texts: a profusion of exalted ideas to rouse the mind, noble histories to stir the soul, universal truths to awaken the conscience and precise injunctions for the deliverance of humanity, all distilled into the melodious essence that is the Word of Allah. Through fourteen centuries Muslims have championed the text against corruption and enthusiastically committed each letter to heart.

This expansive book provides unique insights into the holy text's immaculate preservation, as well as exploring many of the accusations leveled against it. The reception of divine revelations, Prophet Muḥammad's role in disseminating and compiling these verses, and the setting of the text's final external shape, are scientifically examined alongside such topics as the origins of Arabic, the so-called Muṣḥaf of Ibn Masʿūd, and the strict methodology employed in assembling textual fragments.

By way of comparison the author investigates the histories of the Old and New Testaments, relying entirely on Judeo-Christian sources, and uncovers a startling range of alterations in the biblical Scriptures. Using this as a springboard, he illustrates convincingly that Western research into Islam's Holy Book is motivated by more than mere curiosity, and has no scientific bearing on the Qur'ān's integrity.

This monumental effort, a scholarly work composed in an impassioned tone, provides a welcome foundation for sincere study at a time when assailing the Qur'ān has become all too common.

ISBN 978-967-5062-63-6
9 789675 062636
ISLAMIC BOOK TRUST, KUALA LUMPUR
www.ibtbooks.com

AZAM
IBT
Al-Qalam

IAMM Museum Shop
RM 69.00

THE HISTORY OF THE QUR'ĀNIC TEXT

M.M. AL-AZAMI

AZAMI
IBT
AL-QALAM

The History Of The QUR'ĀNIC TEXT

FROM REVELATION TO COMPILATION

A Comparative Study with the Old and New Testaments

SECOND EDITION

M.M. AL-AZAMI

In the Name of Allah, Most Gracious, Most Merciful

The History of the Qurʾānic Text

THE HISTORY OF THE QUR'ĀNIC TEXT

From Revelation to Compilation

A Comparative Study with the Old and New Testaments

MUHAMMAD MUSTAFA AL-A'ZAMI

Azami Publishing House
Islamic Book Trust
Al-Qalam Publishing

Copyright © 2011 Muhammad Mustafa Al-Aʿzami

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

First published 2003 by UK Islamic Academy, Leicester, UK.
Second edition 2008 by Azami Publishing House, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.
Second edition (reprint) 2011 jointly published by

Azami Publishing House
4441 Abdullah bin Arqam St.,
Mohammadiyyah
Riyadh 12361-7104
Saudi Arabia

Islamic Book Trust
607 Mutiara Majestic
Jalan Othman
46000 Petaling Jaya
Selangor, Malaysia
www.ibtbooks.com

Al-Qalam Publishing
349-52252 Range Road 215
Sherwood Park,
Alberta T8E 1B7
Canada
www.al-qalam.org

Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing-in-Publication

Aʿzami, Muhammad Mustafa
The history of the Qur'ānic text : from revelation to compilation : a comparative study with the Old and New Testaments / Muhammad Mustafa al-Aʿzami.

Co-publishers: IBT, Azami Pub. House
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-1-926620-08-4 (bound).--ISBN 978-1-926620-09-1 (pbk.)

1. Koran--History. 2. Koran--Theology.
3. Koran--Criticism, interpretation, etc. I. Title.

BP130.A53 2011 297.1'2267 C2010-906515-8

Printed in Malaysia by
Vinlin Press Sdn. Bhd.
No. 2, Jalan Meranti Permai 1
Meranti Permai Industrial Park
Batu 15, Jalan Puchong
47100 Puchong, Selangor

For my dear mother, whose face
I was too young to remember, whose greatest wish for me
(as I was later told) was to memorize the Qur'an, and who
I hope to meet again in the Gardens of Heaven.
May Allah accept from us our best deeds.
Ameen.

THE AUTHOR

MUHAMMAD MUSTAFA AL-AʿZAMI, one of the world's premier scholar of Ḥadīth, was born in Mau (U.P.), India in the early 1930s and received his education successively at Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband, India (1952), al-Azhar University, Cairo (M.A., 1955), and University of Cambridge (Ph.D., 1966). He is Professor Emeritus at King Saʿūd University (Riyadh) where he also chaired the department of Islamic Studies; he holds a Saudi citizenship. Al-Aʿẓamī served as curator of the National Public Library, Qaṭar; Associate Professor at Umm al-Qurā University (Makkah); Visiting Scholar at University of Michigan (Ann Arbor); Visiting Fellow at St. Cross College (University of Oxford); King Faiṣal Visiting Professor for Islamic Studies at Princeton; and Visiting Scholar at University of Colorado (Boulder). He is also an Honorary Professor at University of Wales (Lampeter). His publications include *Studies in Early Ḥadīth Literature*, *Ḥadīth Methodology and Literature*, *On Schacht's Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, *Dirāsat fī al-Ḥadīth an-Nabawī*, *Kuttāb an-Nabī*, *Manhaj an-Naqd ʿind al-Muḥaddithīn*, and *al-Muḥaddithūn min al-Yamāmah*. Among his edited works are *al-ʿIlal of Ibn al-Madīnī*, *Kitāb at-Tamyīz of Imām Muslim*, *Maghāzī Rasūlullāh of ʿUrwah ibn az-Zubayr*, *Muwaṭṭaʾ of Imām Mālik*, *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Khuzaimah*, and *Sunan ibn Mājah*. Many of his works have been translated internationally, and his forthcoming works include *The Ageless Qurʾān through the Ages*, and *The Isnād System: Its Origins and Authenticity*. In 1980 he was the recipient of the prestigious King Faiṣal International Award for Islamic Studies.

CONTENTS

Preface xvii

PART I: THE HISTORY OF THE QUR'ĀNIC TEXT

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION 3

CHAPTER TWO: EARLY HISTORY OF ISLAM: A BRIEF LOOK 15
1. Pre-Islamic Arabia 15
    - *i. The Geo-Political Condition* 15
    - *ii. Ibrāhīm and Makkah* 16
    - *iii. Quṣayy Gains Full Control of Makkah* 19
    - *iv. Makkah: A Tribal Society* 20
    - *v. From Quṣayy to Muḥammad* 21
    - *vi. The Religious Conditions in Arabia* 22
2. Prophet Muḥammad (53B.H.-11A.H./571-632C.E.) 23
    - *i. The Birth of Muḥammad* 24
    - *ii. Muḥammad, the Amīn* 24
    - *iii. Muḥammad the Messenger of Allāh* 24
    - *iv. Abū Bakr and his Acceptance of Islam* 25
    - *v. The Prophet Preaches Openly* 26
    - *vi. Quraish Offers Muḥammad Great Temptations* 27
    - *vii. Quraish Boycotts Muḥammad and his Clans* 28
    - *viii. The Pledge of 'Aqaba* 29
    - *ix. The Plot to Assassinate the Prophet* 30
    - *x. Muḥammad in Madinah* 30
    - *xi. Prelude to the Battle of Badr* 32
    - *xii. The Execution of Khubaib bin 'Adī al-Anṣārī* 33
    - *xiii. The Conquest of Makkah* 33
3. Death of the Prophet and Accession of Abū Bakr 35
    - *i. Abū Bakr Handles Widespread Apostasies* 35
    - *ii. Military Advances in Syria* 36
4. The Countries and Provinces Conquered During the Reigns of 'Umar and 'Uthmān 37
5. Early Muslim History in Non-Muslim Sources 39
6. Conclusion 42

CHAPTER THREE: REVELATIONS AND THE PROPHET MUḤAMMAD 43
1. The Creator and some of His Attributes 44
    i. The Purpose Behind Mankind's Creation 45
    ii. The Message of the Prophets 45
2. The Final Messenger 46
3. Receiving the Revelations 47
    i. The Beginning of Waḥy and the Miracle of Qurʾān 49
    ii. The Impact of the Prophet's Recitation on the Polytheists 50
4. The Prophet's Roles Regarding the Qurʾān 52
5. Recitation of the Qurʾān in Turns with Jibrīl 54
6. A Few Remarks on Orientalist Claims 55
7. Conclusion 56

CHAPTER FOUR: TEACHING THE QURʾĀN 59
1. Incentives for Learning, Teaching and Reciting the Holy Qurʾān ... 60
2. The Makkan Period 63
    i. The Prophet as Teacher 63
    ii. The Companions as Teachers 64
    iii. The Outcome of this Educational Policy in the Makkan Period .. 64
3. The Madanī Period 65
    i. The Prophet as Teacher 65
    ii. Dialects used by the Prophet for Teaching in Madinah 66
    iii. The Companions as Teachers 66
4. The Fruit of Educational Policy: The Ḥuffāẓ 68
5. Conclusion 69

CHAPTER FIVE: THE RECORDING AND ARRANGEMENT OF THE QURʾĀN 71
1. During the Makkan Period 71
2. During the Madanī Period 72
    i. Scribes of the Prophet 72
    ii. The Prophet's Dictation of the Qurʾān 73
    iii. Recording the Qurʾān was Common Practice Among Companions 73
3. The Arrangement of the Qurʾān 74
    i. The Arrangement of Verses Within Sūras 74
    ii. The Arrangement of Sūras 77
    iii. The Arrangement of Sūras in Some Partial Muṣḥafs 78
4. Conclusion 81

CHAPTER SIX: THE WRITTEN COMPILATION OF THE QURʾĀN 83
1. Compilation of the Qurʾān During Abū Bakr's Reign 84
    i. Appointment of Zaid bin Thābit as Compiler of the Qurʾān 84

    ii. Zaid bin Thābit's Credentials 85
    iii. Abū Bakr's Instructions to Zaid bin Thābit 85
    iv. How Zaid bin Thābit Utilized the Written Materials 87
    v. Zaid bin Thābit and the Use of Oral Sources 89
    vi. Authentication of the Qurʾān: The Case of the Last Two Verses from Sūra Barāʾa 90
    vii. Placement of the Ṣuḥuf into the State Archives 91
2. ʿUmar's Role in the Spread of the Qurʾān 91
3. Conclusion 93

CHAPTER SEVEN: ʿUTHMĀN'S MUṢḤAF 95
1. Disputes in Recitation and ʿUthmān's Response 95
2. ʿUthmān Prepares a Muṣḥaf Directly from the Ṣuḥuf 96
3. ʿUthmān Makes an Independent Copy of the Muṣḥaf 97
    i. Appointing a Committee of Twelve to Oversee the Task 97
    ii. Arranging for an Autonomous Copy 97
    iii. ʿUthmān Retrieves the Qurʾānic Parchments from ʿĀʾisha for Comparison 99
    iv. ʿUthmān Retrieves the Ṣuḥuf from Ḥafṣa for Verification 100
4. The Sanctioning and Distribution of ʿUthmān's Muṣḥaf 102
    i. The Final Copy Read to the Companions 102
    ii. The Number of Certified Copies Made 102
    iii. ʿUthmān Burns All Other Manuscripts 103
    iv. ʿUthmān Sends Reciters Along with Muṣḥafs 103
    v. ʿUthmān's Instructions with the Muṣḥafs He Sent 104
5. Al-Ḥajjāj and His Contributions to the Muṣḥaf 106
6. Muṣḥafs in the Marketplace 110
7. Conclusion 112

CHAPTER EIGHT: THE EVOLUTION OF READING AIDS WITHIN THE MUṢḤAF 115
1. Sūra Separators 115
2. Āyah Separators 116
3. Conclusion 120

CHAPTER NINE: THE HISTORY OF ARABIC PALEOGRAPHY 123
1. The Historical Background of Arabic Characters 123
2. Studies in Early Arabic Documents and Inscriptions 126
    i. The Blurred Line between Nabataean and Arabic Inscriptions .. 126
    ii. What Language Did the Nabataeans Speak? 129
    iii. The Early Arabic Language Possessed a Distinct Script and Alphabet 131

  - *iv. The Emergence of Various Scripts and the Issue of Dating Kūfic Muṣḥafs* 135
- 3. Conclusion 139

Chapter Ten: Arabic Paleography and Orthography in the Qur'ān 141
- 1. Writing Styles During the Time of the Prophet 144
- 2. Studies on the Orthography of ʿUthmān's Muṣḥaf 144
  - *i. Irregularities in the Writing of Alif* 144
  - *ii. Irregularities of Alif in the Ṣanʿāʾ Fragments and their Orthographic Impact* 149
- 3. The Nuqaṭ (Dotting) Scheme in Early Muṣḥafs 151
  - *i. Early Arabic Writings and Skeletal Dots* 151
  - *ii. The Invention of Diacritical Markings* 156
  - *iii. Parallel Usage of Two Different Diacritical Marking Schemes* 159
- 4. Sources of the Skeletal and Diacritical Dotting Systems 160
- 5. Orthographic and Paleographic 'Irregularities' in Early Non-Qur'ānic Script 163
- 6. Conclusion 165

Chapter Eleven: Studies of Existing Muṣḥafs Ascribed to ʿUthmān 167
- 1. Differences Among ʿUthmān's Six Official Muṣḥafs 167
- 2. Studies on the Muṣḥaf of Mālik bin Abī ʿĀmir al-Aṣbaḥī 170
- 3. Existing Muṣḥafs which are Ascribed to Caliph ʿUthmān 172
  - *i. The Copy in Tashkent* 173
  - *ii. The Copy at Topkapi Sarayi* 176
  - *iii. The Copy at Türk ve Islâm Eserleri Müzesi* 177
  - *iv. The Copy at al-Mashhad al-Ḥusainī Mosque* 179
  - *v. The Copy at the Institute of Oriental Studies* 180
- 4. Differences Between ʿUthmān's Master Copies and Existing Muṣḥafs Attributed to him 182
- 5. Other Muṣḥafs from the First Century A.H. 186
- 6. Conclusion 188

Chapter Twelve: Causes of Variant Readings 189
- 1. The Qirā'at is Sunna 190
- 2. The Need for Multiple Readings: Simplifying Recitation for Unaccustomed Masses 191
- 3. Main Cause of Multiple Readings (Variants):the Orientalist View . 193
- 4. Secondary Cause of Multiple Readings (Variants) 197
- 5. Altering a Word for its Synonym During Recitation 199
- 6. Conclusion 201

Chapter Thirteen: The Muslim Educational Methodology 203
- 1. The Hunger for Information 204
- 2. Personal Contact: A Vital Element for Learning 204
- 3. Beginning and Development of the Isnād System 205
  - *i. The Phenomenon of Isnād: Proliferation* 207
- 4. The Authentication of Isnād and Ḥadīth 209
  - *i. Establishing Trustworthiness* 209
  - *ii. The Unbroken Chain* 213
  - *iii. Supporting or Negating Evidence* 213
  - *iv. A Test Case with a Misleading Isnād* 214
- 5. The First Generations of Scholars 215
- 6. Preserving Books from Adulteration: A Unique System 216
  - *i. Conditions for Utilizing a Book* 219
  - *ii. Glosses: the Addition of External Material* 219
  - *iii. Establishing Authorship* 220
- 7. Certificates of Reading 222
  - *i. The Importance of Reading Notes* 223
- 8. Impact of Ḥadīth Methodology on Other Branches 228
- 9. Isnād and the Transmission of the Qur'ān 228
- 10. Conclusion 229

Chapter Fourteen: The So-Called Muṣḥaf of Ibn Masʿūd 231
- 1. First Point: The Arrangement of Ibn Masʿūd's Muṣḥaf 232
- 2. Second Point: The Text Differed from the ʿUthmāni Muṣḥaf 233
- 3. Third Point: Three Sūras were Omitted 234
  - *i. Analysis of the Contents of Ibn Masʿūd's Muṣḥaf* 236
  - *ii. Ibn Masʿūd's Beliefs* 237
- 4. When Can Any Writing be Accepted as Part of the Qur'ān? 238
  - *i. Principles for Determining Whether a Verse Belongs to the Qur'ān* 239
  - *ii. Examples of Scholars Punished for Violating these Principles* .. 242
- 5. Conclusion 243

Part II: The History of the Biblical Scriptures

Chapter Fifteen: Early History of Judaism: A Brief Look 249
- 1. Jewish History Prior to Establishing the Kingdom 249
- 2. Jewish History After Establishing the Kingdom 256
  - *i. The Divided Kingdoms* 257
  - *ii. The Destruction of the First Temple (586 B.C.) and the Babylonian Exile (586-538 B.C.)* 261

    - *iii. The Restoration of Jerusalem and the Founding of the Second Temple (515 B.C.)* 262
    - *iv. The Hellenistic Rule (333-168 B.C.), the Maccabaean Revolt (168-135 B.C.) and the Destruction of the Second Temple (70 C.E.)* 262
3. Conclusion 264

CHAPTER SIXTEEN: THE OLD TESTAMENT AND ITS CORRUPTION 265
1. History of the Old Testament 265
    - *i. History of Torah According to Jewish Sources* 266
    - *ii. History of the Torah According to Modern Scholars* 268
2. The Sources of Jewish Literary Culture 270
    - *i. Original Language of the Old Testament was Not Called Hebrew* 270
    - *ii. The Early Jewish Script: Canaanite and Assyrian* 271
    - *iii. The Sources of the Torah* 272
3. History of the Oral Law 273
4. History of the Hebrew Text: The Masorah 275
    - *i. Only Thirty-One Surviving Masoretic Texts of the OT* 275
5. In Search of an Authoritative Text 277
    - *i. The Role of the Council of Jamnia - Late First Century C.E.* ... 278
    - *ii. The Old Testament Text was known in a Variety of Differing Traditions* 278
    - *iii. Approximately 6000 Discrepancies Between the Samaritan and Jewish Pentateuchs Alone* 279
    - *iv. Unintentional Corruptions of the Text* 280
    - *v. No Qualms Felt in Altering the Text for Doctrinal Reasons* 281
    - *vi. No Single Authoritative OT Text Existed Till 100 C.E.* 282
    - *vii. Jewish Scholars Established the Text of the OT in the Tenth Century, Actively Destroying Earlier Manuscripts* 282
    - *viii. The Masorah and Textual Integrity* 283
6. The Jewish Revival: a Legacy of Islamic Literary Advancements.. 284
    - *i. Pointing and Vocalization Induced by Islamic Achievements*.. 284
    - *ii. Masoretic Activity Flourished in the West Under Islamic Influence* 285
    - *iii. The Talmud and Islamic Influence* 286
7. Establishing the Date for a Fixed, Authoritative OT Text 288
    - *i. Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Western View* 288
    - *ii. The Counter View: The Termina Datum of Qumran and Other Caves is False* 289
8. God's Covenant: Examples of Deliberate Textual Corruption.... 292
9. Conclusion 297

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN: EARLY HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY: A BRIEF LOOK . 301
1. Did Jesus Exist? 301
    - *i. References to Jesus in Non-Christian Books from the First Century* 302
    - *ii. The Historical Christ in Christian Circles* 302
    - *iii. Christ and His Mother-Tongue* 304
    - *iv. Christ: the Moral Attributes of God?* 304
2. Jesus' Disciples 305
3. Jesus and his Message: Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at Hand 306
    - *i. Jesus and the Scope of his Message* 306
    - *ii. Christian Creeds* 307
    - *iii. The Implications of the Term 'Christian' in the Early Days* 309
4. The Persecution of Early Christians 309
5. Belief Systems in Early Christianity 310
6. Conclusions 311

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN: THE NEW TESTAMENT: ITS ANONYMOUS AUTHORSHIP AND CORRUPTION 313
1. The Lost Gospel Q - A Challenge 313
2. The Authorship of the Present Four Gospels 314
3. Are the Gospels Inspired? 315
4. Transmission of the New Testament 316
    - *i. The Creation of Different Text Types* 317
    - *ii. Dates of Recensions* 318
5. Textual Corruption 318
    - *i. Variant Readings in the New Testament* 318
    - *ii. Scribal Alterations* 322
6. The Erasmus Bible and the Comma Johanneum 323
7. Contemporary Corruption of the Text 325
8. Early Manuscripts Negate Prevalent Christian Doctrines 328
9. Conclusion 331

PART III: AN APPRAISAL OF ORIENTALIST RESEARCH

CHAPTER NINETEEN: THE ORIENTALIST AND THE QURʾĀN 335
1. The Urgency of Proving Distortions in the Qurʾān 335
2. Orientalist Criticism of the Qurʾān's Compilation 336
3. Transmutation of Islam into Foreign Idioms 337
4. Allegations of Biblical Forgery 338
    - *i. Accusations of Botched Appropriation* 338
    - *ii. A Counterfeited Bible* 340

5. Deliberate Distortion of the Qurʾān 341
  i. Blachère's Attempted Distortion of the Qurʾān 341
  ii. Mingana's Attempted Distortion of the Qurʾān 342
6. Puin and the Sanʿāʾ Fragments 345
  i. Are the Sanʿāʾ Fragments the Only Proof of the Qurʾān's Completion by the First Century? 347
7. Conclusion 350

Chapter Twenty: Orientalist Motivations: A Study of Subjectivity 353
1. The Jewish Analogue 353
  i. The Validity of an Anti-Semitic Work 353
  ii. Can an Anti-Judaic Scholar be Impartial When Dealing with a Jewish Theme? 354
  iii. Are Jewish Scholars Free to Study Jewish Topics? 355
2. The Muslim Counterpoint 357
  i. Israeli Suppression of Palestinian History 357
  ii. An Orientalist Pioneer and Deceiver of Muslims 358
3. Searching for Impartiality 359
  i. A Historical Perspective: Jews, Christians and Romans 359
  ii. Impartiality in Modern Studies 361
4. Pressure and Purpose 363
  i. Colonialism and the Demoralization of Muslims 363
  ii. The Jewish Question and the Fabrication of a New History ... 365
5. Conclusion 370

Chapter Twenty One: Epilogue 373

Glossary Terms 377

Bibliography 387

Index 403

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

In the Name of Allāh, Most Gracious, Most Merciful

PREFACE

This work comprises a short introduction to the history of the Qurʾān, its recording and its collection. The reader may therefore be puzzled as to why one third of the material in this book tackles the Old Testament (OT) and the New Testament (NT),[1] wondering what significance this has on the Qurʾān's history. This significance shall, I hope, be made clear as the chapters progress, since I have attempted to present only those details which have a direct bearing on the current subject matter.

The idea of authoring a book about the Qurʾān, about its collection and immaculate preservation, had long germinated in my mind, and towards the close of the millennium I finally began working on this book alongside another entitled *Islamic Studies: What Methodology?* It was journalist Toby Lester's article in *The Atlantic Monthly* (January 1999) however, and the chaos it had the potential to sow among Muslims, which prompted a greater concentration on this work. His article suggested that Muslims, despite believing in the Qurʾān as the unadulterated Book of Allāh, were thoroughly incapable of defending this view in any scholarly fashion. The gauntlet was thrown, and I felt it necessary to take on this challenge and explain the stringent methodology used by early Muslim scholars in accepting a text as genuine, or rejecting it as fake. This has lead to the unavoidable repetition of some material in both books. As most of the scholars that Lester quotes are of Judeo-Christian background, I also considered it fitting to cover the histories of the Old and New Testaments by way of comparison. This will help the reader to regard the disparity of opinions between Muslim and Orientalist scholars with a fair measure of insight.

With their insistence on a purely oral transmission, most Orientalists reject all reports that relate to the recording and compilation of the Qurʾān during the Prophet Muḥammad's lifetime. Many of them even deny that any final compilation occurred during Abū Bakr's reign, while some accept the role of the third caliph ʿUthmān in this regard. Only *fifteen years* lapsed between the Prophet's death and ʿUthmān's distribution of written copies of the Qurʾān to different provinces of the Muslim world. Viewing this

---

[1] Certain works now designate these as the First and Second Testaments, most likely to eliminate any suggestion of one having superior authority over the other.

Sheikh Niẓām Yaʿqūbī, Dr. ʿAbdullāh Ṣubayḥ, Haroon Shirwani, and the many others who participated in proofreading the text and providing valuable feedback.

I must also extend tremendous gratitude to my family for their unwavering assistance throughout the many stages of this effort: to my elder son ʿAqīl for his continuous help with manuscript preparation, transliteration, compiling bibliography and typography, to my daughter Fāṭima for her work with cross-references, to my younger son Anas who receives complete credit for making the manuscript's English sound and lucid, and to my daughter-in-law Ruqaiyya Akbar for her work with indexing. And a particular tribute to my wife for tolerating me through fifty years of marriage and suffering through the many sacrifices she has had to bear with extraordinary patience and a loving smile. May Allāh reward all of them for their kindness and generosity.

Finally, my deepest gratitude to Almighty Allāh for providing me with the opportunity and privilege of embarking on this topic; whatever faults are present in this book are entirely my own,[20] and whatever pleases Him is for His Glory alone. I pray that He will accept this work as a sincere effort on His behalf.

The draft of this book has witnessed many revisions, including once in *al-Ḥaram ash-Sharīf* in Makkah during Ramaḍān 1420 A.H./December 1999. After the appearance of the first edition in August 2003 it underwent a few more revisions, culminating in a final revision in Riyadh, Ramaḍān 1429 A.H./September 2008.

M.M. al-Aʿẓamī

---

[20] I can only recall the saying of Imām ash-Shāfiʿī (150-204 A.H./767-820 C.E.): أبي الله العصمة لكتاب غير كتابه ("Allāh has denied that any book should be free of errors aside from His Own.") [A. Shākir (ed.), *ar-Risālah of ash-Shāfiʿī*, p. 73 footnote 8].

I

THE HISTORY OF THE QUR'ĀNIC TEXT

Some will charge that Muslims have no sound arguments with which to counteract non-Muslim scholarship, that for them the case is based entirely on faith and not on reason. I will therefore bring forward my arguments against their findings in future chapters, though I will first begin by recounting some passages from early Islamic history as a prelude to an in-depth look at the Qur'ān.

---

100 A.H.), al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (*d.* 110 A.H.) and Zaid b. Aslam (*d.* 136 A.H.). [Ibn Ḥibban, *al-Majrūḥīn*, i:21-23].

CHAPTER TWO

EARLY HISTORY OF ISLAM: A BRIEF LOOK

1. Pre-Islamic Arabia

i. The Geo-Political Condition

Arabia. Situated near the crossroads of three continents, at the heart of the Old World, the Arabian Peninsula juts out into one of the most recognizable features on the globe. Bordered by the Red Sea to its west, the Persian Gulf to its east, the Indian Ocean to the south and Syria and Mesopotamia to the north, it is famously arid but for the vegetation of the Sarawāt Mountains, which anchor the western coastline. Despite the scarcity of liquid there are a few sources of underground water available, and these have produced oases which have long served as the backbone for human settlements and caravans.

The Arabian Peninsula has been populated since the earliest days of recorded history, the inhabitants of the Persian Gulf actually establishing city-states prior to the third millennium B.C.[1] Many scholars consider this region to be the cradle of all Semitic races, though there is by no means a full consensus. Theories on this cradle include: Babylonia (the opinion of Von Kremer, Guide and Hommel);[2] the Arabian Peninsula (Sprenger, Sayce, DeGoeje, Brockelmann, and others);[3] Africa (Nöldeke and others);[4] Amuru (A.T. Clay);[5] Armenia (Peaters);[6] the southern part of the Arabian Peninsula (Philby);[7] and Europe (Ungnand).[8]

Phillip Hitti, in his work, *History of the Arabs*, says:

> "Though the term 'semitic' has of late come to be used in the West more generally with reference to the Jews because of their concentration in America, it is more appropriately applicable to the inhabitants of Arabia who, more than any other group of

---

[1] Jawād 'Alī, *al-Mufaṣṣal fī Tārīkh al-'Arab Qabl al-Islām*, i:569.
[2] *ibid*, i:230-31.
[3] *ibid*, i:231-32.
[4] *ibid*, i:235.
[5] *ibid*, i:238.
[6] *ibid*, i:238.
[7] *ibid*, i:232-33.
[8] *ibid*, i:238.

> people, have retained the Semitic characteristics in their physical features, manners, customs, habit of thought and language. The people of Arabia have remained virtually the same throughout all the recorded ages."[9]

Many hypotheses regarding racial origins emanate from linguistic research (and occasionally the information supplied by the OT),[10] and much of this is neither scientific nor historically accurate. For example, the OT includes among nations of Semitic stock many who are not Semites, such as the Elamite and Ludim, whilst discarding many which are Semitic, such as the Phoenicians and Cannanites.[11] Given the myriad viewpoints, I subscribe to the notion that the Semitic races emerged from within Arabia. As to the question of who is or is not Semitic, Arabs and Israelites share a common ancestry through Abraham.[12]

ii. Ibrāhīm and Makkah

At a fixed time in history Allāh bestowed on Ibrāhīm (Abraham) a son in his old age, Ismāʿīl (Ishmael), whose mother Hājar (Hagar) – supposedly a slave – was a gift tendered by Pharos to Sārah. Ismāʿīl's birth stirred great jealousy in Sārah's heart, and she demanded that Ibrāhīm cast out this 'bondwoman' and her son.[13] Faced with this domestic squabble, he brought Hājar and Ismāʿīl to the barren land of Makkah, to a harsh sun-beaten valley bereft of inhabitants, food, and even water. As he began the trek home, Hājar gazed at the emptiness around her in bewilderment, and asked him thrice whether he was deserting them. He made no reply. Then she asked whether this was the command of Allāh, and he replied: yes. Hearing this she said, "Then He will not abandon us". And indeed He did not abandon them, causing the waters of Zamzam to eventually gush out of the sand at the infant Ismāʿīl's feet; this spring made possible the first settlements in the area, with Jurhum being the earliest tribe to settle there.[14]

Several years later Ibrāhīm, on a visit to his son, informed him of a vision:

---

[9] M. Mohar Ali, *Sirat an-Nabī*, vol. 1A, pp. 30-31, quoting P.K. Hitti, *History of the Arabs*, pp. 8-9.

[10] Jawād ʿAlī, *al-Mufaṣṣal*, i:223.

[11] *ibid*, i:224.

[12] *ibid*, i:630. The OT declares that both Arabs and Jews are descendants of Shem, son of Noah.

[13] *King James Version (KJV)*, Genesis 21:10.

[14] Al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, al-Anbiyā', ḥadīth nos. 3364-65 (with Ibn Ḥajar's commentary).

﴿ فَلَمَّا بَلَغَ مَعَهُ ٱلسَّعْىَ قَالَ يَـٰبُنَىَّ إِنِّىٓ أَرَىٰ فِى ٱلْمَنَامِ أَنِّىٓ أَذْبَحُكَ فَٱنظُرْ مَاذَا
تَرَىٰ ۚ قَالَ يَـٰٓأَبَتِ ٱفْعَلْ مَا تُؤْمَرُ ۖ سَتَجِدُنِىٓ إِن شَآءَ ٱللَّهُ مِنَ ٱلصَّـٰبِرِينَ ۝١٠٢ فَلَمَّآ
أَسْلَمَا وَتَلَّهُۥ لِلْجَبِينِ ۝١٠٣ وَنَـٰدَيْنَـٰهُ أَن يَـٰٓإِبْرَٰهِيمُ ۝١٠٤ قَدْ صَدَّقْتَ ٱلرُّءْيَآ ۚ إِنَّا
كَذَٰلِكَ نَجْزِى ٱلْمُحْسِنِينَ ۝١٠٥ إِنَّ هَـٰذَا لَهُوَ ٱلْبَلَـٰٓؤُا۟ ٱلْمُبِينُ ۝١٠٦ وَفَدَيْنَـٰهُ بِذِبْحٍ
عَظِيمٍ ۝١٠٧ ﴾[15]

> "Then, when [the son] reached [the age of serious] work with him, [Ibrāhīm] said: 'O my son! I see in a dream that I offer you in sacrifice: now see what is your view!' [The son] said: 'O my father! Do as you are commanded: you will find me, if Allāh so wills, one practicing Patience and Constancy! ... And We ransomed him with a momentous sacrifice."[16]

On the heels of this incident, Ibrāhīm and Ismāʿīl received a divine commission to establish the first sanctuary on earth dedicated for the sole worship of Allāh.

﴿ إِنَّ أَوَّلَ بَيْتٍ وُضِعَ لِلنَّاسِ لَلَّذِى بِبَكَّةَ مُبَارَكًا وَهُدًى لِّلْعَـٰلَمِينَ ۝٩٦ ﴾[17]

> "The first House [of worship] appointed for people was that at Bakka; full of blessing and of guidance for all beings"

Bakka[18] is another name for Makkah, and in that rocky vale both father and son concerted their efforts towards the construction of the sacred Kaʿba, with the piety of one whose grueling ordeal had just been resolved by the Almighty Himself. Upon its completion Ibrāhīm made the following supplication:

---

[15] Qur'ān 37:102-7.

[16] The translation of verses 103-6 has been dropped for brevity.

[17] Qur'ān 3:96.

[18] The OT also mentions the name of Bakka in connection with pilgrimage. Quoting the King James Version, "*Who* passing through the valley of Baca make it a well; the rain also filleth the pools" [Psalm 84:6]. While most Bible translators render this passage as 'valley of Baca', some of them opt instead to treat it as an adjective rather than a proper noun. So we get 'valley of Weeping' [*American Standard Version*]; 'Dry Valley' [*Contemporary English Version*]; 'vale of tears' [*Douay-Rheims Bible*], *etc.* Interestingly the site of 'Baca' is unknown to biblical scholars. The *CEV* footnotes, "Dry Valley: Or 'Balsam Tree Valley'. The exact location is not known," and in the *New American Bible*, "Baca valley: Hebrew obscure; probably a valley on the way to Jerusalem". It is generally believed that King David himself authored this Psalms, longing for the opportunity to accompany the pilgrims on their journey. The site of the pilgrimage cannot be Solomon's Temple in Jerusalem for, as the name implies, it was constructed during the reign of King Solomon and did not exist in David's lifetime. For a more thorough discussion of the subject see A.S. Ghawri, *The Only Son Offered for Sacrifice: Isaac or Ishmael?*, Al-Mawrid, Lahore, 2004, pp. 125-37.

﴿ رَّبَّنَآ إِنِّىٓ أَسْكَنتُ مِن ذُرِّيَّتِى بِوَادٍ غَيْرِ ذِى زَرْعٍ عِندَ بَيْتِكَ ٱلْمُحَرَّمِ رَبَّنَا
لِيُقِيمُوا۟ ٱلصَّلَوٰةَ فَٱجْعَلْ أَفْـِٔدَةً مِّنَ ٱلنَّاسِ تَهْوِىٓ إِلَيْهِمْ وَٱرْزُقْهُم مِّنَ ٱلثَّمَرَٰتِ
لَعَلَّهُمْ يَشْكُرُونَ ﴿٣٧﴾ ﴾[19]

> "O our Lord! I have made some of my offspring to dwell in a valley without cultivation, by Your Sacred House; in order, O our Lord, that they may establish regular Prayer: So fill the hearts of some among men with love toward them, and feed them with Fruits: So that they may give thanks."

Soon the roots of this supplication had visibly blossomed and Makkah was no longer desolate, gaining life in the presence of Allāh's noble sanctuary, the waters of Zamzam, and a burgeoning population. It eventually became a central junction on the trade routes to Syria, Yemen, Ṭā'if and Nejd,[20] which is why "from the time of Aellius Gallus down to Nero all the emperors cherished the desire of extending their influence to the important station of Mecca and made tentative efforts in this direction".[21]

There were naturally other population movements within the Arabian Peninsula. Of note were the Jewish refugees who, many centuries later, introduced Judaism to Arabia during the Babylonian Exile, settling in Yathrib (present-day Madinah), Khaibar, Taimā' and Fadak in 587 B.C.E. and 70 C.E.[22] Nomadic Arab tribes were also in flux. Banū Thaʿliba (the tribe of Thaʿliba) from the Qaḥṭānite stock also settled in Madinah; among their descendants were the tribes of Aws and Khazraj, later dually known as al-Anṣār[23] (Supporters of the Prophet). Banū Hāritha, later known as Banū Khuzāʿa, settled in Ḥejāz and displaced the earlier inhabitants, Banū Jurhum,[24] becoming the custodians of the House in Makkah. They were subsequently responsible for introducing idol worship.[25] Banū Lakhm, another clan of Qaḥṭānite origin, settled in Ḥīra (present-day Kūfa in Iraq) where they founded a buffer state between Arabia and Persia (*c.* 200-602 C.E.).[26] Banū Ghassān settled in lower Syria and founded the Ghassanid Kingdom, a buffer state between Byzantine and Arabia, which lasted till 614 C.E.[27] Banū Ṭayy occupied the Ṭayy Mountains while Banū Kinda settled in central Arabia.[28] The common feature of all these tribes was their lineage to Ibrāhīm through Ismāʿīl.[29]

This section is not meant to serve as a history of Makkah prior to Islam, but as a starting point for the closest ancestral family member of the Prophet who had a direct bearing on his life. For the sake of brevity I will pass over numerous details and pick up the trail with Quṣayy, the great-great-great grandfather of the Prophet.

iii. Quṣayy Gains Full Control of Makkah

Some two hundred years prior to the Prophet's birth, Quṣayy, a keenly intelligent, powerful and highly administrative chieftain, ascended within the ranks of Makkah's political scene. Taking advantage of the Byzantine interest in Makkah, he acquired their help in securing full control of the city while successfully remaining outside Byzantine influence and neglecting their regional interests.[30]

Quṣayy married Ḥubbā bint Hulail, the daughter of the Khuzāʿite chieftain of Makkah; this chieftain's death allowed him to assume further power and pass custody of the House into the hands of his descendants.[31] The tribe of Quraish, scattered throughout the region, was finally brought together in Makkah and forged into a single unity under his leadership.[32]

The following is Quṣayy's genealogy in brief:[33]

---

[19] Qurʾān 14:37.

[20] M. Hamidullah, "The City State of Mecca", *Islamic Culture*, vol. 12 (1938), p. 258. Cited thereafter as *The City State of Mecca*.

[21] *ibid*, p. 256, quoting Lammens, *La Mecque à La Vielle de L'Hegire* (pp. 234, 239) and others.

[22] Jawād ʿAlī, *al-Mufaṣṣal fī Tārīkh al-ʿArab Qabl al-Islām*, i:658; *ibid*, i:614-18 contain very important information on Jewish settlements in Yathrib and Khaibar.

[23] M. Mohar Ali, *Sirat an-Nabī*, vol. 1A, p. 32.

[24] *ibid*, vol. 1A, p. 32.

[25] Ibn Qutaiba, *al-Maʿārif*, p. 640.

[26] M. Mohar Ali, *Sirat an-Nabī*, vol. 1A, p. 32.

[27] *ibid*, vol. 1A, p. 32.

[28] *ibid*, vol. 1A, p. 32.

[29] *ibid*, vol. 1A, p. 32.

[30] Ibn Qutaiba, *al-Maʿārif*, pp. 640-41. The Byzantine Empire had a new prospect of extending their influence on Makkah a few generations later when a Makkan, ʿUthmān ibn al-Ḥuwairith of the Asad clan, embraced Christianity. The emperor placed a crown on his head and sent him to Makkah with Ukase, ordering the Makkans to accept him as their king. But even his own tribe refused to accept him [*The City State of Mecca*, pp. 256-57, quoting as-Suhailī (*Rauḍul unf*, i:146) and others].

[31] Ibn Hishām, *Sīra*, ed. by M. Saqqā, I. al-Ibyārī and ʿA. Shalabī, 2nd edition, Muṣṭafā al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī, publishers, Cairo, 1375 (1955), vol. 1-2, pp. 117-18. This book has been printed in two parts; part one covers volumes 1-2, part two covers volumes 3-4. The page numbering of each part runs continuously.

[32] Ibn Qutaiba, *al-Maʿārif*, pp. 640-41.

[33] Ibn Hishām, *Sīra*, vol. 1-2, pp. 105-8. For the dates in the chart, see Nabia Abbott, *The Rise of the North Arabic Script and its Kuranic Development, with a full Description of the Kuran Manuscripts in the Oriental Institute*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1938, pp. 10-11. Abbott has mentioned some disagreement among Orientalists about the dates.

Quṣayy
(born c. 400 C.E.)
ʿAbdul-Dār
ʿAbd Manāf
(born c. 430 C.E.)
ʿAbd
ʿAbdul-ʿUzza
Naufal
Muṭṭalib
Hāshim
(born c. 464 C.E.)
ʿAbd Shams
Asad
ʿAbdul Muṭṭalib
(born c. 497 C.E.)
Abū Ṣaifi
Naḍla
Ḥamza
Abū Ṭālib
ʿAbbās
Zubair
ʿAbdullāh
(born c. 545 C.E.)
Ḍirār
Al-Muqawwim
Ḥajla
Ḥārith
Abū Lahab
ʿAlī
Jaʿfar
Muḥammad (ﷺ)
(born c. 570 C.E.)

Figure 2.1: A brief genealogy of Quṣayy.

iv. Makkah: A Tribal Society

Though developed as a city-state, Makkah remained a tribal society up until its conquest by the Prophet Muḥammad. The mainstay of Arab society around which all social organization revolved, the tribe was based on the concept that the sons of any one clan were brothers and shared the same blood. An Arab would not have understood the idea of nation-statehood unless it was within the context of the nation-state of the tribe,

> "which was a nation-state of relationship binding the family to the tribe, a state based on flesh and bones, on flesh and blood, *i.e.* a nation-state based on lineage. It was family connections that bound together the individuals in the state and gathered them into one unit. This was for them the religion of the state and its agreed and acknowledged law."[34]

Every tribal member constituted an asset for the entire tribe, so that the presence of an accomplished poet, an intrepid warrior, or someone of famed hospitality within the tribe, generated honor and credit for all those of his lineage. Among the prime duties of every stalwart clan was defense, not only of its own members but also those who temporarily came under its umbrella as guests, and in protecting the latter there was always much honor to be gained. Thus Makkah, the city-state, welcomed people who either sought to attend fairs, or perform pilgrimage,[35] or pass through with their caravans. Serving this demand required security and the appropriate facilities, and so the following institutions were set up in Makkah (some of them by Quṣayy himself):[36] *Nadwa* (city council), *Mashūra* (advice council), *Qiyāda* (leadership), *Sadāna* (administration of the sanctuary), *Ḥijāba* (gate-keeper of the Kaʿba), *Siqāya* (supplying water to the pilgrims), *ʿImāratul-bait* (ensuring that the sanctity of the Kaʿba was not violated), *Ifāda* (those who permitted the first departure in a ceremony), *Ijāza*, *Nasīʾ* (the institution of adjusting the calendar), *Qubba* (pitching a tent to collect donations for some public emergency), *Aʿinna* (reins of the horse), *Rafāda* (tax for feeding the poor pilgrims), *Amwāl muḥajjara* (offerings to the Sanctuary), *Aysār*, *Ashnāq* (assessing the value of pecuniary liabilities), *Ḥukūma*, *Sifārah* (ambassadorship), *ʿUqāb* (standard-bearer), *Liwāʾ* (banner) and *Ḥulwān-un-nafr* (mobilization gratuity).

v. From Quṣayy to Muḥammad

These sundry duties became the responsibility of Quṣayy's sons. Descendants of ʿAbdul-Dār for example retained the custody of the Kaʿba, the council-hall and the right of mounting the banner on its staff in case of war.[37] ʿAbd-Manāf managed the foreign relations "with the Roman authorities, and the Ghassanide prince. Hāshim [son of ʿAbd-Manāf] himself concluded a treaty, and he is said to have received from the Emperor a rescriph authorizing the Quraish to travel through Syria in security".[38] Hāshim and his party maintained the office of providing food and water to the pilgrims; his wealth allowed him to entertain pilgrims with princely magnificence.[39]

While trading in Madinah, Hāshim met and became enamored of a Khazarite noblewoman, Salma bint ʿAmr. He married her and returned with her to Makkah but, with the onset of pregnancy, she chose to journey back to Madinah and there gave birth to a son, Shaiba. Hāshim died in Gaza on one of his trade journeys,[40] entrusting his brother Muṭṭalib to take care of his son[41] who was still with his mother. Traveling to Madinah for this purpose,

---

[34] Ibn Hishām, *Sīra*, vol. 3-4, p. 315.

[35] By this time the Kaʿba was surrounded and housed with hundreds of idols.

[36] *The City State of Mecca*, pp. 261-76.

[37] William Muir, *The Life of Mahomet*, 3rd edition, Smith, Elder, & Co., London, 1894, p. xcvi.

[38] *ibid*, p. xcvii.

[39] *ibid*, p. xcvi.

[40] Ibn Hishām, *Sīra*, vol. 1-2, p. 137.

[41] *ibid*, vol. 1-2, p. 137.

Muṭṭalib found himself embroiled in a fight with Hāshim's widow over the custody of young Shaiba, in which he ultimately prevailed. With uncle and nephew returning to Makkah, people mistook the little boy to be the slave (عبد: ʿAbd) of Muṭṭalib. Hence Shaiba's nickname: ʿAbdul-Muṭṭalib.[42]

Following Muṭṭalib's death, ʿAbdul-Muṭṭalib inherited the duties of *Siqāya* and *Rafāda*.[43] And having rediscovered Zamzam, whose waters had been buried and forgotten beneath the weight of sand and neglect for many years, he gained such prominence and dignity that he effectively became the chief of Makkah. In earlier years he had made a vow that if granted ten sons, he would sacrifice one of them to an idol. Now, having been blessed with this number, ʿAbdul-Muṭṭalib sought to fulfill his pledge by consulting with the *Azlām*[44] to find out whom to sacrifice. The name of his youngest (and favorite) son ʿAbdullāh appeared. Human sacrifices being distasteful to Quraish, the tribe conferred with a soothsayer who revealed that ʿAbdullāh could be ransomed with camels. The *Azlām* were consulted again, and the boy's life was spared for the price of one hundred camels.

Delighted with this turn of events, ʿAbdul-Muṭṭalib took his favorite son to Madinah to visit some relatives. There ʿAbdullāh married Āmina, the niece of Wuhaib who was their host and of the same ancestral tribe (Quṣayy's brother founded Banū Zuhra, Wuhaib's clan). ʿAbdullāh enjoyed the domestic comforts of home life for some time before embarking on a trade route to Syria. Along the way he fell ill, returned to Madinah and died. By then Āmina had already conceived Muḥammad.

vi. *The Religious Conditions in Arabia*

In the time preceding Muḥammad's prophethood, Arabia was thoroughly antagonistic to any religious reformation. For centuries the cult of pagan worship had withstood both the presence of Jewish settlements and foreign attempts at evangelization from Syria and Egypt. William Muir, in his *The Life of Mahomet*, argues that this Jewish presence helped to neutralize the spread of the gospel in two ways; first, by establishing itself in the northern frontiers of Arabia, and thus forming a barrier between the Christian expanses to the north and the pagan stronghold to the south. His second argument is that Arabian idolatry had formed a sort of compromise with Judaism, incorporating enough of its legends to diminish the exotic appeal of Christianity.[45] I do not concur at all with his theory. What the Arabs professed in fact was a distorted remnant of Ibrāhīm and Ismāʿīl's monotheistic faith, corrupted by centuries of superstition and ignorance. The legends which the Jews and Arabs held in common were, therefore, a result of their common ancestry.

The Christianity of the 7th century was itself mired in corruption and myth, caught in a state of complete stagnation. Formally submitting Arabia to Christianity would have required, not religious persuasion, but the political coercion of a superior Christian power.[46] No such power bore down upon the pagan Arabs, and idolatry held Arabia in the tightest of grips. Five centuries of Christian evangelism had produced meager results: converts were limited to the Banū Ḥārith of Najran, the Banū Ḥanīfa of Yamāmah, and some of the Banū Ṭayy at Taymāʾ.[47] In these five centuries, historical records do not show any incidence involving the persecution of Christian missionaries. This is vastly different from the fate which awaited Muḥammad and his earliest followers in Makkah, revealing perhaps that while Christianity was viewed as a tolerable nuisance, Islam was deemed overtly dangerous to the institutional fabric of pagan Arabia.

2. Prophet Muḥammad (53B.H.-11A.H./571-632C.E.)[48]

Covering the life of the Prophet of Islam is an immense undertaking, one that can easily fill volumes; copious literature is readily available on this topic for every interested reader. The aim of this section is somewhat different. In upcoming chapters we will discuss some of the prophets of Israel, including Jesus, and witness both their hostile reception by the Israelites and the rapid corruption of their divine teachings. Here, in lieu of retracing paths already carved out by other writers, I will simply offer a brief synopsis to complement such future references to Moses and Jesus.

---

[42] *ibid*, vol. 1-2, p. 137.

[43] *ibid*, vol. 1-2, p. 142.

[44] A procedure for picking a candidate randomly, using divining arrows that were kept under the protection of a certain deity.

[45] William Muir, *The Life of Mahomet*, pp. lxxxii-lxxxiii.

[46] *ibid*, p. lxxxiv. This also holds true for more recent times, when Christianity was often advanced by dint of Colonialist coercion.

[47] *ibid*, pp. lxxxiv-lxxxv.

[48] The Christian date is approximate. Invented using the model of the Islamic Calendar, it did not come into official public use until at least ten centuries after Jesus (most likely more), passing through several modifications. The Gregorian calendar as presently used goes back only to 1582 C.E./990 A.H. when it was adopted by the then-Catholic countries on the decree of Pope Gregory XIII, in a Papal Bull on 24 February 1582. [See Khalid Baig, "The Millennium Bug", *Impact International*, London, vol. 30, no. 1, January 2000, p. 5]. Modern writers project back the dates fictitiously, thus creating many problems in the dating of events.

i. The Birth of Muḥammad

As mentioned earlier ʿAbdullāh, Muḥammad's father, died while Āmina was in pregnancy. Muḥammad was therefore born into precarious circumstances, a member of a poor but very noble family. Soon bereft of his mother as well, he became an orphan at the age of six and took to working as a shepherd in Makkah's barren landscape.[49] Following in the footsteps of Quraishi fashion he began engaging in trade, and here his integrity and success as a merchant attracted the attention of an older and particularly intelligent rich widow, Khadīja, who eventually married him.[50] Muḥammad was renowned throughout the city for this honesty and integrity in all matters; quoting Ibn Isḥāq: "Prior to the revelations, Quraish regarded the Prophet as 'the trustworthy one' [الأمين: *amīn*]".[51]

ii. Muḥammad, the Amīn

There came a time when Quraish concurred on the necessity of rebuilding the Kaʿba. They allocated the work among themselves, each sub-clan gathering stones and assembling a portion of the structure by itself. As the construction reached the Black Stone (الحجر الأسود) a controversy ignited. Every sub-clan quarreled for the sole honor of depositing the stone into its appropriate corner, to the point where alliances were quickly formed and hostilities appeared inevitable. Abū Umayya, at the time the oldest man in Quraish, urged them to consent to the judgment of the first man entering the gate of the Holy Sanctuary, and they approved. It so happened that the first to enter was none other than Muḥammad. Seeing him Quraish exclaimed, "Here comes the *amīn*, we are pleased with him [as a judge]. Here comes Muḥammad". When he was informed of the dispute he asked for a cloak. Taking the stone and placing it on the cloak, he told each sub-clan to clutch a side of the garment and lift it collectively. This they did, and once they were at the designated spot he raised the Black Stone and set it in with his own hands. With the controversy dissipated to everyone's satisfaction, the construction continued without incident.[52]

iii. Muḥammad the Messenger of Allāh

Blessed with an ideal nature and a hatred of idolatry, Muḥammad never prostrated before Quraish's idols nor took part in any of their polytheistic rituals. Instead he worshipped one God, in whatever manner he thought best, his complete illiteracy precluding any knowledge of Jewish or Christian practices. Soon the time was ripe for his commission as Prophet and Messenger, and Allāh prepared him for this task gradually. First he started beholding true visions.[53] He noticed a rock saluting him;[54] he also observed the Archangel Jibrīl (Gabriel) calling him from the sky by his name,[55] and observed a light.[56]

ʿĀʾisha reports that the prelude of prophethood for Muḥammad were his perfect dreams: for six months he witnessed visions so accurate that they seemed to materialize from the very fabric of reality. Then suddenly the first revelation descended upon him while he was secluded in the cave of Ḥirāʾ; Jibrīl appeared before him and repeatedly asked him to read, countering Muḥammad's insistence that he was illiterate by continuing the same demand, till at last he divulged to him the first verses of *Sūra al-ʿAlaq*:[57]

﴿ اقْرَأْ بِاسْمِ رَبِّكَ الَّذِي خَلَقَ ① خَلَقَ الْإِنسَانَ مِنْ عَلَقٍ ② اقْرَأْ وَرَبُّكَ الْأَكْرَمُ
③ الَّذِي عَلَّمَ بِالْقَلَمِ ④ عَلَّمَ الْإِنسَانَ مَا لَمْ يَعْلَمْ ⑤ ﴾[58]

> "Read in the name of your Lord and Cherisher, who created. Created man, out of a leech-like clot. Proclaim! And your Lord is Most Bountiful. He Who taught [the use of] the Pen. Taught man that which he knew not."

This was the first descent of the *waḥy* (وحي: revelation), the very beginning of the Qurʾān.

And so, unexpectedly at the age of forty, Allāh summoned Muḥammad with a simple message, sharply outlined and crystal clear: لا إله إلا الله محمد رسول الله ('There is no god except Allāh, and Muḥammad is His Messenger'). And with this he was given a living eternal miracle, something to satisfy the intellect, capture the heart, and give rebirth to stifled souls: the Holy Qurʾān.

iv. Abū Bakr and his Acceptance of Islam

The first man to embrace Islam outside the Prophet's family was Abū Bakr ibn Quḥāfa (later nicknamed aṣ-Ṣiddīq), an experienced and well-respected

---

[49] Al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, Ijāra:2.
[50] Ibn Hishām, *Sīra*, vol. 1-2, pp. 187-89
[51] *ibid*, vol. 1-2, p. 197.
[52] *ibid*, vol. 1-2, pp. 196-97.

---

[53] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, i:19; al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, Badʾ al-Waḥy:2.
[54] Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, Faḍāʾil:2, p. 1782.
[55] ʿUrwah b. az-Zubair, *al-Maghāzī*, compiled by M.M. al-Aʿẓamī, Maktab at-Tarbiya al-ʿArabia Liduwal al-Khalīj, 1st edition, Riyāḍ, 1401 (1981), p. 100.
[56] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, i:23.
[57] Sūra 96, see al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, Badʾ al-Waḥy.
[58] Qurʾān 96:1-5.

bin al-Walīd to Ṭulaiḥa bin Khuwailid; ʿIkrima son of Abū Jahl, with Shuraḥbīl, to Musailama; Muhājir son of Abū Umayya to the remnants of al-Aswad al-ʿAnsī, then to Ḥaḍramout; Khālīd bin Saʿīd bin al-ʿĀṣ to al-Ḥamqatain, near the Syrian border; ʿAmr bin al-ʿĀṣ to Quzuʿah and others; Ḥudhaifa bin Miḥsin al-Ghalafānī to Daba, on the Gulf of Oman; ʿArfaja bin Ḥarthama to Mahara; Ṭuraifa bin Ḥājiz to Banī Sulaim; Suwaid bin Muqarrin to Tahāma of Yemen; Al-ʿAlā' bin al-Ḥaḍramī to Baḥrain; and Shuraḥbīl b. Ḥasana to Yamāmah and Quḍāʿa.[90]

Of these, perhaps the largest and fiercest battle was waged in Yamāmah against Musailama, whose forces exceeded forty thousand and enjoyed very strong tribal ties in the area. ʿIkrima was initially sent to finish him, but because of his limited success he was dispatched to some other region. Shuraḥbīl, who had been sent to assist ʿIkrima, was now told to wait for the arrival of a new commander, Khālid bin al-Walīd, who by the grace of Allāh successfully vanquished Musailama's imposing army.

Following the suppression of these rebellions and the return of the Arabian Peninsula to Muslim control, Abū Bakr next ordered Khālid bin al-Walīd to march towards Iraq.[91] There he encountered and defeated the Persians at Ubulla, Lady's Castle, Mazār, Ullais (Ṣafar 12 A.H./May 633 C.E.), Walajah the river of blood (in the same month), Amghisia, and Ḥīra (12 A.H./*c.* 634 C.E.),[92] where he established his headquarters.[93] After Ḥīra he advanced to Anbār and discovered a fortified city with protective ditches. His terms for peace being accepted however, he proceeded to ʿAīn at-Tamr, a town straddling the desert three days west of Anbār.[94] Here the enemy was a potent mixture of Persians and Arab Christians, some belonging to the Christian prophetess Sajāḥ;[95] in the ensuing battle the Christians fought more fiercely than the Persians. Both were defeated and the city fell to the Muslims.

ii. Military Advances in Syria

Regaining the Peninsula at the end of 12 A.H. (633 C.E.), Abū Bakr formulated a plan to conquer Syria. His first two choices of commander, Khālid bin Saʿīd bin al-ʿĀṣ followed by ʿIkrima bin Abū Jahl, met with limited success. So he divided the region into four zones and appointed a commander to each: Abū ʿUbaidah bin al-Jarrāḥ to Ḥimṣ (in the western part of present day Syria); Yazīd bin Abī Sufyān to Damascus; ʿAmr bin al-ʿĀṣ to Palestine; and Shuraḥbīl bin Ḥasana to Jordan.

The Romans had acted accordingly, setting up four regiments of their own. Abū Bakr then amended his strategy and ordered his four generals to join together, in the process directing Khālid bin al-Walīd to race swiftly to Syria with half his army to assume the position of commander-in-chief. There he was blessed with tremendous success, while elsewhere Muslim armies advanced swiftly against various other adversaries.

4. The Countries and Provinces Conquered During the Reigns of ʿUmar and ʿUthmān

- Yarmūk or Wacusa, 5 Rajab, 13 A.H. (Sept. 634 C.E.);
- Battle of Qādisīya, Ramaḍān, 14 A.H. (Nov. 635 C.E.);
- Baʿalbak, 25 Rabīʿ I, 15 A.H. (636 C.E.);
- Ḥimṣ and Qinnasrīn, captured in 15 A.H. (636 C.E.);
- Palestine and Quds (Jerusalem) in Rabīʿ II, 16 A.H. (637 C.E.);
- Capture of Madian, 15-16 A.H. (636-7 C.E.);
- Jazīra (Ruḥa, Raqqa, Nasībain, Ḥarrān, Mardien), mostly inhabited by Christians, in 18-20 A.H. (639-40 C.E.);
- Conquest of Persia: Nehāvand, 19-20 A.H. (640 C.E.);
- Egypt (excluding Alexandria) in 20 A.H. (640 C.E.);
- Alexandria in 21 A.H. (641 C.E.);
- Barqa (Libya) in 22 A.H. (642 C.E.);
- Tripoli (Libya) in 23 A.H. (643 C.E.);
- Cyprus in 27 A.H.[96] (647 C.E.);
- Armenia in 29 A.H. (649 C.E.);
- Dhāt as-Sawārī, naval war in 31 A.H. (651 C.E.);
- Azerbaijan, Deulaw, Marw (Merv), and Sarakhs in 31 A.H. (651 C.E.);
- Kirmān, Sijistān, Khurasān and Balkh, also in 31 A.H. (651 C.E.).

And so, after ruling 395 years, the curtains fell for the Sassanid (Persian) Dynasty at the hands of a newly born nation of three decades, which boasted

---

[90] Aṭ-Ṭabarī, *Tārīkh*, iii:249; see also W. Muir, *Annals of the Early Caliphate*, pp. 17-18.

[91] According to the historian Khalīfa bin Khayyāṭ this was in 12 A.H. [*Tārīkh*, i:100.]

[92] H. Mones, *Atlas of the History of Islam*, az-Zahrā' for Arab Mass Media, Cairo, 1987, p. 128.

[93] W. Muir, *Annals of the Early Caliphate*, p. 81.

[94] *ibid*, p. 85.

[95] *ibid*, p. 85.

[96] A tombstone with an Arabic inscription was discovered in Famagusta, Cyprus, dated Ramaḍān 29 A.H./650 C.E. The tombstone is that of the well-known Companion ʿUrwah b. Thābit [A. Elad, "Community of Believers of 'Holy Men' and 'Saints' or Community of Muslims? The Rise and Development of Early Muslim Historiography," *Journal of Semitic Studies*, vol. xlvii, 2002, pp. 281-87].

The Muslim State
MUSLIM TERRITORIES AT THE TIME OF
▨ The Prophet Muḥammad (1-11 A.H.)
▨ Caliph Abū Bakr (11-13 A.H.)
▨ Caliph 'Umar (13-23 A.H.)
▨ Caliph 'Uthmān (23-35 A.H.)
BLACK SEA
BYZANTINE EMPIRE
MEDITERRANEAN SEA
ARMENIA
AZERBAIJAN
CASPIAN SEA
TABARISTAN
KHURASAN
PERSIA
AFGHANISTAN
Marw
Nishapur
Herat
(Aleppo) Halab
MESOPOTAMIA
SYRIA
CYPRUS
Damascus
al-Quds (Jerusalem)
Kufa
(Ctesiphon) Madain
Basra
Tripoli
TRIPOLITANIA
CYRENAICA
al-Fustat (Cairo)
EGYPT
SINAI
RED SEA
ARABIA
Madinah (Yathrib)
Makkah
YAMAMAH
BAHRAIN
PERSIAN GULF
FARS
KIRMAN
MAKRAN
OMAN
HADRAMOUT
YEMEN

Figure 2.3: Border of the Islamic state at the end of the third caliph's reign (35 A.H./655 C.E.).

neither administrative experience nor war expertise. This could not have occurred save for the Muslims' unshakeable faith in Allāh, His Messenger, and the supremacy of Islam. According to Prof. Hamidullah[97] the territories conquered by the end of Caliph 'Uthmān's reign totaled roughly three and a half million square miles. Figure 2.3 shows the expansion of the Islamic state.[98]

Moses and the twelve tribes of Israel had wandered the Sinai desert—no more than one hundred miles in radius—for forty years as punishment for discarding the orders of Allāh; in less time than that the Muslims successfully acquired almost all of what is now the Middle East and Iran.

---

[97] M. Hamidullah, *al-Wathā'iq as-Siyāsīyya*, pp. 498-99.

[98] In compiling this map we have consulted several sources: *ibid*; H. Mones, *Aṭlas Tārīkh al-Islām*, Al-Zahraa for Arab Mass Media, Cairo, 1987, pp. 78, 146; and R.F. Treharne (ed.), *Muir's Atlas of Medieval and Modern History*, George Phillip and Sons Ltd, London, 1982 reprint of the 11th edition (1969), p. 6. According to Hamidullah's estimate the conquest areas are: 1,000,000 sq. miles during the Prophet's lifetime, 200,000 sq. miles during Abū Bakr's reign, 1,500,000 sq. miles during 'Umar's reign and 800,000 sq. miles during 'Uthmān's [op. cit., pp. 498-99].

5. Early Muslim History in Non-Muslim Sources

In the previous chapter we mentioned Y. Nevo, an authority within the new revisionist school who argues that external non-Muslim evidence must be found to verify every Muslim account. The absence of such corroboration entails that the Muslim side of the story be discarded as fiction.[99] In case of a conflict between both sources, he adds, the non-Muslim source is always preferred.[100] Going through a massive collection of materials, R. Hoyland has done a commendable job in showing the non-Muslim evidence bearing on the rise of Islam and Muḥammad.[101] Many of these non-Muslim sources are contemporary and date only a few years after the actual events took place.[102]

Among these, the earliest explicit reference to Prophet Muḥammad is a Syriac manuscript written *c.* 640 C.E. by Thomas the Presbyter, who writes that, "In the year 945, indiction 7, on Friday 4 February at the ninth hour, there was a battle between the Romans and the Arabs of Muḥammad (Syr *ṭayyāye d-Mḥmt*) in Palestine twelve miles east of Gaza. The Romans fled … The Arabs ravaged the whole region."[103]

In the history of ps.-Juansher, part of the Georgian historical corpus known as *K'art'lis ts'khovreba*, we read that, "Muḥammad (Geo *Mohamadi*), a descendent of Ishmael, teacher of the religion of the Saracens[104] … conquered all Arabia and Yemen," and was succeeded by Abū Bakr (Geo *Abobik'ari*), who "conquered Persia, entered Baghdad, and by force compelled innumerable people to abandon fire-worship, converting them to the Saracen [religion]."[105] The author is also aware that the Muslims had their own holy book, the Qurʾān (Geo *Kurani*).[106]

---

[99] J. Koren and Y. Nevo, "Methodological Approaches to Islamic Studies", *Der Islam*, Band 68, Heft 1, 1991, pp. 89-92.

[100] *Ibid*, pp. 92-93.

[101] R.G. Hoyland, *Seeing Islam as Others Saw It: A Survey and Evaluation of Christian, Jewish and Zoroastrian Writings on Early Islam*, The Darwin Press Inc., Princeton, NJ, 1997.

[102] In certain quotes the three letter symbol inside parenthesis represents the name of the language as defined by the ISO 639-2 code: Syr is Syriac, Geo is Georgian. A good source for converting dates back and forth is G.S.P Freeman-Grenville, *The Muslim and Christian Calendars*, Second edition, Rex Collings Ltd, London, 1977.

[103] Hoyland, op. cit., p. 120. The precise dating leaves no doubt that it ultimately came from first-hand knowledge. The battle is dated 4th February A.G. 945 (634 C.E.) = 28 Dhūl Qi'da 12 A.H. which fits the date for the battle of Dāthin/Dāthinah near Gaza, and according to Muslim historians, took place from 29 Dhūl Qi'da to the first of Dhūl Ḥijja, 12 A.H. The Muslim army was commanded by Abū Umāmah al-Bāhilī [N. Ṣubḥah, *Shuhadā' aṣ-Ṣaḥāba wa A'lāmuhum fī Falasṭīn*, Dār al-Fārouq, 2000].

[104] In Christian writing the name 'Saracens' meant "those empty of Sarah" or "not from Sarah" or as in the case of *K'art'lis ts'khovreba*, "the dogs of Sarah" [Hoyland, op. cit., p. 684, footnote 19]. A derogatory term, it was first used as reference to Arabs and was later on extended to encompass all Muslims, Arabs and non-Arabs alike [see "Saracen", *Encyclopeadia Britannica*].

In the Chronicle of Fredegar, there is a description of the Arab conquests which begins with Heraclius divining by means of astrology that "his empire would be laid waste by circumcised races," whereupon he commanded that all Jews throughout his empire be baptized and sought assurances from the Frankish king Dagobert that he would do the same.[107] Describing subsequent events he writes that, "The Hagarenes, who are also called Saracens ... had now grown so numerous that at last took up arms and threw themselves upon the provinces of the emperor Heraclius, who dispatched an army to hold them. In the ensuing battle the Saracens were the victors and cut the vanquished to pieces. It is said that the Saracens killed in this engagement 150,000 men."[108] This is probably an account of the Battle of Yarmūk.

A record of the Arab conquest of Syria in 15 A.H./636 C.E. appears in a sixth century Syriac manuscript a few faint lines scribbled alongside the gospels according to Matthew and Mark. The text is poorly preserved and many of the readings are unclear or disputable. It reads, "In January [the people of] Ḥimṣ took the word for their lives and many villages were ravaged by the killing of [the Arabs of] Muḥammad (Syr *Mūḥmd*) ... On the twentieth of August in the year n[ine hundred and forty-]seven there gathered in Gabitha [a multitude of] the Romans, and many people [of the R]omans were kil[led], [s]ome fifty thousand."[109]

A short Nestorian document, known as the Chronicle of Khuzistan, written *c.* 660 C.E., covers the period from the death of Hormizd son of Khusrau to the end of the Persian Empire. The chronicle recounts that, after a two year siege of Shustar,[110] a man from Qaṭar who lived there became friends with someone who owned a house along the walls, and together they conspired to let the Arabs in through a tunnel dug inside

---

[105] Hoyland, op. cit., p. 684.

[106] *Ibid*, p. 684.

[107] *Ibid*, p. 218. The source is a Latin chronicle in 90 chapters, covering the period 584 until 642 C.E. (*c.* 22 A.H.) [*ibid*, p. 216].

[108] *Ibid*, p. 218.

[109] Ibid, p. 116-17. Due to the fragmentary nature of the document, whatever appears in brackets is unreadable and any letters/words given therein are conjectured. There is strong evidence that the author was a contemporary [*ibid*, p. 117]. The date of the battle, 20th August A.G. 947 (636 C.E.) corresponds to 12th Rajab 15 A.H.

[110] An ancient fortress city in the Khuzistan province in southwestern Iran, approximately 92 km from Ahvaz.

the walls in return for a third of the city's spoils.[111] Furthermore it gives a brief account of the Muslim invasions, "whose leader was Muḥammad (*Mḥmd*). Neither walls nor gates, armor or shield, withstood them, and they gained control over the entire land of the Persians. Yazdgird sent against them countless troops, but the Arabs routed them all and even killed Rustam. ... Heraclius, the Byzantine king, sent armies against them, but the Arabs killed more than 100,000 of them."[112]

Figure 2.4: The ancient fortress city of Shustar in the Khuzistan province.

Prior to the 7th century the Chinese had hardly even heard of the Arabs, but in 638 C.E. the T'ang emperor T'ai-tsung received an appeal from the Persian ruler Yazdgird III for help in ousting the Arabs who had invaded his territory. And as late as 737 C.E. various descendants of Yazdgrid frequented the T'ang court in hopes of securing aid to repel the Arabs.[113] Some of the more interesting facts mentioned in the Chinese records pertain to Muslims daily life: that they offer ritual prayers five times a day, that women when going out cover their faces irrespective of social status, that every seven days the king comes out to perform religious services from a high pulpit and preaches to the multitudes, that their clothes are clean and their manners elegant, that when they quarrel among themselves they do not resort to brute force, and that "the people lack nothing of what the earth produces. [Their country] is the hub of the universe where myriad goods are abundant and inexpensive."[114]

---

[111] *Ibid*, p. 184.

[112] *Ibid*, p. 186.

[113] *Ibid*, p. 243.

[114] *Ibid*, pp. 244-47. These observations are based on the personal experience of *Ching-hsing chi* of Tu Huan, who was taken prisoner after the battle of Talas before being allowed to return to China in 762 C.E./145 A.H. The material itself appeared in a

fundamental differences between Islam and the two preceding corrupted monotheistic religions, and define some of the ideals that Allāh conveyed to the world at large in His final revelation.

1. The Creator and some of His Attributes

Clearly we did not create ourselves, as no creature has the power to create itself out of nothingness. Allāh asks in the Holy Qur'ān:

﴿ أَمْ خُلِقُوا۟ مِنْ غَيْرِ شَىْءٍ أَمْ هُمُ ٱلْخَٰلِقُونَ ٣٥ ﴾[2]

"Were they created of nothing, or were they themselves the creators?"

All creation therefore emanates from a Creator.

﴿ ذَٰلِكُمُ ٱللَّهُ رَبُّكُمْ ۖ لَآ إِلَٰهَ إِلَّا هُوَ ۖ خَٰلِقُ كُلِّ شَىْءٍ فَٱعْبُدُوهُ ۚ وَهُوَ عَلَىٰ
كُلِّ شَىْءٍ وَكِيلٌ ١٠٢ ﴾[3]

"That is Allāh, your Lord! There is no god but He, the Creator of all things, so worship Him; He has the power to dispose of all affairs"

﴿ لَقَدْ خَلَقْنَا ٱلْإِنسَٰنَ فِىٓ أَحْسَنِ تَقْوِيمٍ ٤ ﴾[4]

"We have indeed created man in the best of molds."

The Creator is unique, nothing has been fashioned in His Image. He is also without kin, the one and only God.

﴿ قُلْ هُوَ ٱللَّهُ أَحَدٌ ١ ٱللَّهُ ٱلصَّمَدُ ٢ لَمْ يَلِدْ وَلَمْ يُولَدْ ٣ وَلَمْ يَكُن لَّهُۥ
كُفُوًا أَحَدٌۢ ٤ ﴾[5]

"Say: He is Allāh, The One; Allāh, the Eternal, Absolute; He did not beget, nor is He begotten; and there is none like unto Him."

He is gracious, merciful and loving. He rewards good deeds most generously if done with sincerity, and accepts repentance from the truly penitent. He forgives as He pleases, but does not forgive those who ascribe other gods besides Him and die unrepentant.

---

[2] Qur'ān 52:35.
[3] Qur'ān 6:102.
[4] Qur'ān 95:4.
[5] Qur'ān 112:1-4.

﴿ قُلْ يَٰعِبَادِىَ ٱلَّذِينَ أَسْرَفُوا۟ عَلَىٰٓ أَنفُسِهِمْ لَا تَقْنَطُوا۟ مِن رَّحْمَةِ ٱللَّهِ ۚ إِنَّ ٱللَّهَ
يَغْفِرُ ٱلذُّنُوبَ جَمِيعًا ۚ إِنَّهُۥ هُوَ ٱلْغَفُورُ ٱلرَّحِيمُ ٥٣ ﴾[6]

"Say: O my servants who have transgressed against their souls! despair not of the mercy of Allāh: for Allāh forgives all sins: for He is oft-forgiving, Most Merciful."

﴿ إِنَّ ٱللَّهَ لَا يَغْفِرُ أَن يُشْرَكَ بِهِۦ وَيَغْفِرُ مَا دُونَ ذَٰلِكَ لِمَن يَشَآءُ ۚ وَمَن يُشْرِكْ بِٱللَّهِ
فَقَدِ ٱفْتَرَىٰٓ إِثْمًا عَظِيمًا ٤٨ ﴾[7]

"Allāh forgives not that partners should be set up with Him; but He forgives anything else to whom He pleases; whoever sets up partners with Allāh has committed a most heinous sin indeed."

i. *The Purpose Behind Mankind's Creation*

Allāh created humans solely that they may worship Him.

﴿ وَمَا خَلَقْتُ ٱلْجِنَّ وَٱلْإِنسَ إِلَّا لِيَعْبُدُونِ ٥٦ ﴾[8]

"I have created jinns and men, only that they may worship Me."

Given that food, water, shelter, reproduction and thousands of other matters are inextricably tied to human survival, Islam has transformed all these into acts of worship, so long as the intention behind them is to better exalt Allāh.

ii. *The Message of the Prophets*

Within mankind Allāh instilled a nature that leads instinctively to His worship alone, provided there is no external interference.[9] To compensate for such interferences He dispatched messengers from time to time, to displace the webs of idolatry and superstition and guide people to the proper way of worship.

---

[6] Qur'ān 39:53.
[7] Qur'ān 4:48.
[8] Qur'ān 51:56.
[9] This is clear from the *ḥadīth* of the Prophet, "There is none born but is created to his true nature [Islam]. It is his parents who make him a Jew or a Christian or a Magian …" [Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, rendered into English by Abdul-Hamid Siddiqi, Sh. M. Ashraf, Kashmiri Bazar – Lahore, Pakistan, *ḥadīth* no. 6423]

﴿ وَمَا كُنَّا مُعَذِّبِينَ حَتَّىٰ نَبْعَثَ رَسُولًا ١٥ ﴾[10]

> "Nor would We send down Our wrath until We had sent a messenger [to give warning]."

The Creator purged His messengers, paragons of virtue and piety without exception, from all evil. They were model examples of human behavior, and instructed their respective communities to follow their lead in the worship of Allāh. Their core message throughout history was ageless.

﴿ وَمَآ أَرْسَلْنَا مِن قَبْلِكَ مِن رَّسُولٍ إِلَّا نُوحِىٓ إِلَيْهِ أَنَّهُۥ لَآ إِلَٰهَ إِلَّآ أَنَا۠ فَٱعْبُدُونِ ٢٥ ﴾[11]

> "Never did We dispatch a messenger before you without revealing to him this: that there is no god but I; therefore worship Me."

The message of all the prophets was,

﴿ فَٱتَّقُوا۟ ٱللَّهَ وَأَطِيعُونِ ١٠٨ ﴾[12]

> "So be mindful of Allāh, and obey me."

The concise phrase لا إله إلا الله (there is no god but Allāh) is the core belief uniting all the prophets from Adam to Muḥammad; the Qur'ān approaches this theme time and again, particularly calling the attention of Jews and Christians to this point.

2. The Final Messenger

In the arid heat of Makkah, Prophet Ibrāhīm thought of the nomads who would come to settle in that barren valley and entreated his Creator:

﴿ رَبَّنَا وَٱبْعَثْ فِيهِمْ رَسُولًا مِّنْهُمْ يَتْلُوا۟ عَلَيْهِمْ ءَايَٰتِكَ وَيُعَلِّمُهُمُ ٱلْكِتَٰبَ وَٱلْحِكْمَةَ
وَيُزَكِّيهِمْ ۚ إِنَّكَ أَنتَ ٱلْعَزِيزُ ٱلْحَكِيمُ ١٢٩ ﴾[13]

> "Our Lord! send amongst them a Messenger of their own, who shall rehearse Your Signs to them and instruct them in the Book and Wisdom, and purify them: for You are the Exalted in Might, the Wise."

And at a fixed time, in that same barren land, Allāh planted the fruit of Ibrāhīm's supplication in the form of His last messenger to all humanity.

---

[10] Qur'ān 17:15.
[11] Qur'ān 21:25.
[12] Qur'ān 26:108. See also the same Sūra verses: 110, 126, 131, 144, 150, 163 and 179. This indicates that all the prophets have asked the same from their community.
[13] Qur'ān 2:129.

﴿ مَّا كَانَ مُحَمَّدٌ أَبَآ أَحَدٍ مِّن رِّجَالِكُمْ وَلَٰكِن رَّسُولَ ٱللَّهِ وَخَاتَمَ ٱلنَّبِيِّۦنَ ﴾[14]

> "Muḥammad is not the father of any of your men, but [he is] the Messenger of Allāh, and the Seal of the Prophets."

﴿ وَمَآ أَرْسَلْنَٰكَ إِلَّا كَآفَّةً لِّلنَّاسِ بَشِيرًا وَنَذِيرًا وَلَٰكِنَّ أَكْثَرَ ٱلنَّاسِ لَا
يَعْلَمُونَ ٢٨ ﴾[15]

> "We have not sent you but [as a messenger] to all mankind, giving them glad tidings and warning them [against sin]; but most people are not aware."

﴿ وَمَآ أَرْسَلْنَٰكَ إِلَّا رَحْمَةً لِّلْعَٰلَمِينَ ١٠٧ ﴾[16]

> "We have not sent you but as a mercy for all worlds."

As Allāh Willed it, so it came to be, that an unlettered shepherd should carry the burden of receiving, teaching and disseminating a revelation intended to last till the end of history: a heavier responsibility than that shouldered by all previous messengers combined.

3. Receiving the Revelations

Concerning the revelation of the Qur'ān we find verse 2:185,

﴿ شَهْرُ رَمَضَانَ ٱلَّذِىٓ أُنزِلَ فِيهِ ٱلْقُرْءَانُ هُدًى لِّلنَّاسِ وَبَيِّنَٰتٍ مِّنَ ٱلْهُدَىٰ
وَٱلْفُرْقَانِ ﴾

> "The month of Ramaḍān in which the Qur'ān was [first] bestowed from on High as a guidance unto man and a self-evident proof of that guidance..."

And in verse 97:1,

﴿ إِنَّآ أَنزَلْنَٰهُ فِى لَيْلَةِ ٱلْقَدْرِ ١ ﴾

> "Behold, from on High We bestowed this [divine writ] on the Night of Destiny."

Over a span of twenty-three years the Qur'ān came to be revealed bit-by-bit according to the impending circumstances. Ibn 'Abbās (*d.* 68 A.H.), one of the greatest scholars among the Companions, explains that the Qur'ān was sent in its entirety to the lowest heaven of the world (*Bait al-'Izza*) in one night, arriving from there to the earth in stages as necessary.[17]

---

[14] Qur'ān 33:40.
[15] Qur'ān 34:28.
[16] Qur'ān 21:107.

The reception of revelation (*waḥy*) is outside the realm of the common person's experiences. For the previous fourteen centuries no true messenger has existed, nor will there be another, so to understand the phenomenon of *waḥy* we have to depend solely on the reports that come authentically from the Prophet, and from those trustworthy individuals who witnessed him.[18] These narrations may perhaps mirror what other prophets experienced as well, in the throes of divine communication.

- Al-Ḥārith bin Hishām inquired, "O Messenger of Allāh, how does the revelation come to you?" He replied, "Sometimes it comes like the ringing of a bell, and that is the hardest on me, then it leaves me and I retain what it said. And sometimes the angel approaches me in human form and speaks to me, and I retain what he said".[19] 'Ā'isha related, "Verily I saw the Prophet when the revelation descended upon him on a day severe with cold, before leaving him. And behold, his brow was streaming with sweat".[20]
- Ya'lā once told 'Umar of his desire to observe the Prophet while he was receiving *waḥy*. At the next opportunity 'Umar called out to him, and he witnessed the Prophet "with his face red, breathing with a snore. Then the Prophet appeared relieved [of that burden]".[21]
- Zaid b. Thābit stated, "Ibn Um-Maktūm came to the Prophet while he was dictating to me the verse,

  ﴿ لَّا يَسْتَوِى ٱلْقَـٰعِدُونَ مِنَ ٱلْمُؤْمِنِينَ ﴾[22]

  '*Not equal are those believers who sit …*' On hearing the verse Ibn Um-Maktūm said, 'O Prophet of Allāh, had I the means I would most certainly have participated in Jihād'. He was a blind man. So Allāh revealed [the remainder of the verse] to the Prophet while his

---

[17] As-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān*, i:117.

[18] There are many events that can be described to, but not fully comprehended by, someone whose limited range of experiences gets in the way. An easy example is describing a landscape (let alone its colors!) to a blind person, or the chirping of birds to someone who is deaf. They may be able to appreciate *some* of the description, but not to the full extent of someone blessed with hearing and eyesight. In the same sense, the descriptions of the *waḥy* and how the Prophet felt during its reception are, to the rest of us, matters beyond our complete grasp.

[19] Al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, Bad' al-Waḥy:1.

[20] *ibid*, Bad' al-Waḥy:1.

[21] Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, Manāsik:6.

[22] Qur'ān 4:95.

  thigh was on mine and it became so heavy that I feared my thigh would break".[23]

Clear physiological changes enmeshed the Prophet during *waḥy*, but at all other times his manner and speech were normal. He never possessed any control as to when, where, and what the revelations would say, as is evident from numerous incidents. I have chosen the following two examples arbitrarily:

- In the case of some people slandering his wife 'Ā'isha, and accusing her of mischief with a Companion, the Prophet received no immediate revelation. In fact he suffered for an entire month because of these rumors before Allāh declared her innocence:

  ﴿ وَلَوْلَآ إِذْ سَمِعْتُمُوهُ قُلْتُم مَّا يَكُونُ لَنَآ أَن نَّتَكَلَّمَ بِهَـٰذَا سُبْحَـٰنَكَ هَـٰذَا بُهْتَـٰنٌ عَظِيمٌ ﴿١٦﴾ ﴾[24]

  "And why did you not [O people], when you heard [the rumor], say, 'It is not right of us to speak of this: glory to You [our Lord] this is a most serious slander!'"

- Meanwhile, in the case of Ibn Um-Maktūm's objection on account of his blindness, the Prophet received the revelation instantly:

  ﴿ لَّا يَسْتَوِى ٱلْقَـٰعِدُونَ مِنَ ٱلْمُؤْمِنِينَ غَيْرُ أُو۟لِى ٱلضَّرَرِ وَٱلْمُجَـٰهِدُونَ فِى سَبِيلِ ٱللَّهِ بِأَمْوَٰلِهِمْ وَأَنفُسِهِمْ ﴾[25]

  "Not equal are those believers who sit [at home]—excepting those who are disabled—and those who strive and fight in the cause of Allāh with their goods and their lives."

i. The Beginning of Waḥy and the Miracle of Qur'ān[26]

Preparing the future prophet for his role was a gradual process, a time in which puzzling occurrences and visions seemed to precipitate about him, and in which the Archangel Jibrīl repeatedly let his presence be known.[27]

---

[23] Al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, Jihād:30.

[24] Qur'ān 24:16.

[25] Qur'ān 4:95.

[26] In the following pages I will backtrack a little, relating some incidents from Muḥammad's first few years as Prophet. These differ from the biographical overview of the previous chapter in that the focus here is explicitly on the Qur'ān.

[27] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, viii:716.

Chapter Four

TEACHING THE QURʾĀN

﴿ ٱقْرَأْ بِٱسْمِ رَبِّكَ ٱلَّذِى خَلَقَ ۝ ﴾[1]

"Read! in the name of your Lord and Cherisher, Who created."

There are no indications that the Prophet ever studied the art of the pen, and it is generally believed that he remained unlettered throughout his life. The above verse then, the very start of revelation, provides a clue—not about *his* own literacy, but about the importance of establishing a robust educational policy for the masses that were to come. Indeed, he employed every possible measure to spread the spirit of education, describing the merits and rewards for learning as well as the punishment for withholding knowledge. Abū Huraira reports that the Prophet said,

> "If anyone pursues a path in search of knowledge, Allāh will thereby make easy for him a path to paradise."[2]

Conversely he warned,

> "He who is asked about something he knows and conceals it will have a bridle of fire placed around him on the Day of Resurrection."[3]

He ordered the literate and illiterate to cooperate with one another and admonished those who did not learn from, or teach, their neighbors.[4] A special significance was given to the skill of writing, which in one *ḥadīth* is described as the duty of a father towards his son.[5] He also championed free education; when ʿUbāda bin aṣ-Ṣāmit accepted a bow from a student as a gift (which he intended to use in the cause of Islam), the Prophet rebuked him,

> "If it pleases you to place a bridle of fire around your neck then accept that gift."[6]

---

[1] Qurʾān 96:1.

[2] Abū Khaithama, *al-ʿIlm*, ḥadīth no. 25.

[3] At-Tirmidhī, *Sunan*, al-ʿIlm:3.

[4] Al-Haithamī, *Majmaʿ az-Zawāʾid*, i:164.

[5] Al-Kattānī, *at-Tarātīb al-Idārīya*, ii:239, quoting ad-Durr al-Manthūr, Abū Nuʿaim and ad-Dailamī.

[6] Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, vi:315.

Even non-Muslims were employed in teaching literacy.

> "Ransoms for the prisoners of Badr varied. Some of them were told to instruct children on how to write."[7]

1. Incentives for Learning, Teaching and Reciting the Holy Qur'ān

The Prophet spared no effort in piquing the community's eagerness to learn the Word of Allāh:

a. ʿUthmān bin ʿAffān reports that the Prophet said, "The best among you is the one who learns the Qur'ān and teaches it".[8] The same statement is reported by ʿAlī bin Abī Ṭālib.[9]

b. According to Ibn Masʿūd the Prophet remarked, "If anyone recites a letter from the Book of Allāh then he will be credited with a good deed, and a good deed attains a tenfold reward. I do not say that *Alif Lām Mīm* are one letter; but *Alif* is a letter, *Lām* is a letter and *Mīm* is a letter".[10]

c. Among the immediate rewards for learning the Qur'ān was the privilege of leading fellow Muslims in prayer as imām, a crucial post especially in the early days of Islam. ʿĀ'isha and Abū Masʿūd al-Anṣārī both report that the Prophet said, "The person who has memorized, or learned, the Qur'ān the most will lead the others in prayer".[11] ʿAmr b. Salima al-Jarmī recounts that the people of his tribe came to the Prophet, intending to embrace Islam. As they turned to depart they asked him, "Who will lead us in prayer?", and he replied, "The person who has memorized the Qur'ān, or learned it, the most".[12] During the Prophet's last days it was Abū Bakr's privilege to lead the daily prayers, and this proved to be his greatest credential when the time came to appoint a caliph for the Muslim nation.

d. Another benefit was the electrifying possibility of observing the angels. Usaid bin Ḥuḍair was reciting the Qur'ān in his enclosure one night

---

[7] Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ii:14. Also Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, i:247.

[8] Al-Bukhārī, ix:74, no. 5027-8; Abū Dāwūd, *Sunan*, ḥadīth no. 1452; Abū ʿUbaid, *Faḍā'il*, pp. 120-124.

[9] Abū ʿUbaid, *Faḍā'il*, p. 126.

[10] At-Tirmidhī, *Sunan*, Faḍā'il al-Qur'ān:16; see also Abū ʿUbaid, *Faḍā'il*, p. 61.

[11] Abū ʿUbaid, *Faḍā'il*, p. 92; at-Tirmidhī, *Sunan*, ḥadīth no. 235; Abū Dāwūd, *Sunan*, ḥadīth no. 582-584.

[12] Abū ʿUbaid, *Faḍā'il*, p. 91; al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, no. 8:18; Abū Dāwūd, *Sunan*, no. 585, 587.

when his horse began jumping about frantically. Repeatedly he would stop till the horse was calm, and begin reciting only to have the horse jump wildly again. Eventually he stopped altogether for fear of having his son trampled; while standing near the horse he observed something like an overhanging canopy above him, illuminated with lamps and ascending through the sky till it disappeared. The next day he sought out the Prophet and informed him of the night's occurrences. The Prophet told him that he should have continued reciting, and Usaid bin Ḥuḍair replied that he had only stopped on account of his son Yaḥyā. The Prophet then said, "Those were the angels listening to you, and had you continued reciting, the people would have seen them in the morning for they would not have concealed themselves from them".[13]

e. Ibn ʿUmar narrates from the Prophet, "Envy is justified in only two cases: a man who, having received knowledge of the Qur'ān from Allāh, stays awake reciting it night and day; and a man who, having received wealth from Allāh, spends on others night and day".[14]

f. ʿUmar bin al-Khaṭṭāb states that the Prophet said, "With this Book Allāh exalts some people and lowers others".[15]

g. Several illiterate elders found memorizing the Qur'ān to be arduous, their minds and bodies being frail. They were not denied its blessings however, for great rewards were promised to those who listened to the Qur'ān as it was recited. Ibn ʿAbbās said that whoever listens to a verse from the Book of Allāh will be granted light on the Day of Judgment.[16]

h. It was quite possible that a person, not having memorized well enough to recite from memory, may feel an inkling of laziness in searching for a written copy. So the Prophet stated, "A person's recitation without the aid of a Muṣḥaf [written copy] elicits a reward of one thousand degrees, but his recitation using a Muṣḥaf doubles that reward to two thousand".[17]

i. In expounding on the excellence of the *ḥuffaẓ* (حفّاظ: those who commit the entire Qur'ān to memory), ʿAbdullāh bin ʿAmr reports that the Prophet said, "The one who was devoted to the Qur'ān will be told [on the Day of Judgment] to recite and ascend, and to recite with the same care he practiced while he was in this world, for he will reach his abode [in Heaven] with the last verse he recites".[18]

---

[13] Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, English translation by Ṣiddīqī, ḥadīth no. 1742. See also ḥadīth nos. 1739-1740.

[14] Abū ʿUbaid, *Faḍā'il*, p. 126; al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, Tawḥīd:46; Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, Ṣalāt al-Musāfirīn, no. 266; at-Tirmidhī, *Sunan*, no. 1937.

[15] Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, Ṣalāt al-Musāfirīn, no. 269; Abū ʿUbaid, *Faḍā'il*, p. 94. See also Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, Ṣalāt al-Musāfirīn, no. 270, the same incident but narrated through ʿĀmir b. Wāthila al-Laithī.

[16] Abū ʿUbaid, *Faḍā'il*, p. 62; al-Faryābī, *Faḍā'il*, p. 170.

[17] As-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān*, i:304, quoting aṭ-Ṭabarī and al-Baihaqī in Shuʿab al-Imān. Narrated by Aus ath-Thaqafī.

j. And for that lethargic slice of society which favors idleness over these benefits, the Prophet confronted them with warnings. Ibn ʿAbbās narrates that the Prophet said, "A person who has nothing of the Qurʾān within him is like a ruined house".[19] He also condemned the forgetting of verses after having memorized them as a grievous sin, and advised people to go through the Qurʾān regularly. Abū Mūsā al-Ashʿarī reports that the Prophet said, "Keep refreshing your knowledge of the Qurʾān, for I swear by Him in Whose Hand is the life of Muḥammad that it is more liable to escape than hobbled camels".[20]
k. Al-Ḥārith bin al-Aʿwar relates a story that occurred after the Prophet's death.

> "While passing by the Mosque I encountered people indulging in [insidious] talk, so I visited ʿAlī and told him this. He asked me if this was true and I confirmed it. Then he said, 'I heard the Prophet declare, "Dissension will certainly come". I asked the Prophet how it could be avoided, and he replied, "*Kitābullāh* [كتاب الله: Book of Allāh] is the way, for it contains information of what happened before you, news of what will come after you and a decision regarding matters that will occur among you. It is the Distinguisher and is not jesting. If any overweening person abandons it, Allāh will break him, and if anyone seeks guidance elsewhere Allāh will lead him astray. It is Allāh's stalwart rope, the wise reminder, the straight path; it is that by which desires do not swerve nor the tongue becomes confused, and the learned cannot grasp it completely. It is not worn out by repetition nor do its wonders ever cease. It is that of which the jinn did not hesitate to remark when they heard it: 'We have heard a wonderful recitation which guides to what is right, and we believe in it'; he who utters it speaks the truth, he who acts according to it is rewarded, he who pronounces judgment according to it is just, and he who invites people to it guides them to the straight path."'"[21]

Truth, reward, grandeur, beauty, wisdom, justice, guidance. With this brightest of jewels before him, how did the Prophet achieve the momentous aim of teaching the Qurʾān to each and every Muslim? This can best be answered if we divide the subject into two main periods: Makkah and Madinah.

---

[18] Abū Dāwūd, *Sunan*, hadith no. 1464; at-Tirmidhī, *Sunan*, no. 2914; al-Faryābī, *Faḍāʾil*, ḥadīth nos. 60-1.

[19] At-Tirmidhī, *Sunan*, Faḍāʾil al-Qurʾān, ḥadīth no. 2913.

[20] Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, English translation by Ṣiddīqī, no. 1727. See also no. 1725.

[21] At-Tirmidhī, *Sunan*, Faḍāʾil al-Qurʾān:14, ḥadīth no. 2906.

2. The Makkan Period

i. The Prophet as Teacher

Most of the Qurʾān was revealed in Makkah; as-Suyūṭī provides a lengthy list of the sūras revealed there.[22] The Qurʾān served as a tool of guidance for the distraught souls that found a life of idol worship intolerable; its dissemination throughout the infant, persecuted Muslim community necessitated direct contact with the Prophet.

1. The first man to embrace Islam outside the Prophet's family was Abū Bakr. The Prophet invited him to Islam by reading some verses from the Qurʾān.[23]
2. Abū Bakr subsequently brought some of his friends to the Prophet, including ʿUthmān bin ʿAffān, ʿAbdur-Raḥmān bin ʿAuf, az-Zubair bin al-ʿAwwām, Ṭalḥa, and Saʿd bin Abī Waqqāṣ. Again the Prophet presented the new faith to them by reading verses from the Qurʾān and they all embraced Islam.[24]
3. Abū ʿUbaidah, Abū Salama, ʿAbdullāh bin al-Arqam and ʿUthmān bin Maẓʿūn visited the Prophet, enquiring about Islam. The Prophet explained it to them and then recited the Qurʾān. All of them accepted Islam.[25]
4. When ʿUtba b. Rabīʿa went to the Prophet with his proposal, on behalf of Quraish, offering him every conceivable temptation in exchange for abandoning his mission, the Prophet waited patiently before replying, "Now listen to me," and then reciting a few verses as his response to the offer.[26]
5. Some twenty Christians from Ethiopia visited the Prophet in Makkah enquiring about Islam. He explained it to them and recited the Qurʾān, and they all became Muslim.[27]
6. Asʿad bin Zurāra and Dhakwān traveled from Madinah to Makkah to see ʿUtba bin Rabīʿa regarding a contention of nobility (مُنافرة: *munāfara*), when they heard news of the Prophet. They visited him and, hearing a recitation of the Qurʾān, they too accepted Islam.[28]
7. During one of the pilgrimage seasons the Prophet met with a delegation from Madinah. He explained the tenants of Islam and recited a few verses. They all embraced Islam.[29]

---

[22] As-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān*, i:22-50.

[23] Ibn Isḥāq, *as-Seyar wa al-Maghāzī*, edited by Suhail Zakkār, p. 139.

[24] *ibid*, p. 140.

[25] *ibid*, p. 143.

[26] Ibn Hishām, *Sīra*, vol. 1-2, pp. 293-94.

[27] Ibn Isḥāq, *as-Seyar wa al-Maghāzī*, ed. by Zakkār, p. 218.

[28] Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, iii/2:138-39.

[29] Ibn Hishām, *Sīra*, vol. 1-2, p. 428.

8. In the second pledge of ʿAqaba, the Prophet again recited the Qurʾān.[30]
9. He recited to Sūwaid bin Ṣāmit in Makkah.[31]
10. Iyās bin Muʿādh came to Makkah, seeking an alliance with Quraish. The Prophet visited him and recited the Qurʾān.[32]
11. Rāfiʿ bin Mālik al-Anṣārī was the first to bring *Sūra Yūsuf* to Madinah.[33]
12. The Prophet taught three of his Companions *Sūras Yūnus, Ṭaha*, and *Hal-atā* respectively.[34]
13. Ibn Um Maktūm came to the Prophet asking him to recite the Qurʾān.[35]

ii. The Companions as Teachers

- Ibn Masʿūd was the first Companion to teach the Qurʾān in Makkah.[36]
- Khabbāb taught the Qurʾān to both Fāṭima (ʿUmar bin al-Khaṭṭāb's sister), and her husband Saʿīd bin Zaid.[37]
- Muṣʿab bin ʿUmair was dispatched to Madinah as a teacher.[38]

iii. The Outcome of this Educational Policy in the Makkan Period

This flurry of educational activity in Makkah continued unabated despite the boycotting, harassment and torture which the community forcibly endured; this stalwart attitude was the most convincing proof of their attachment to and reverence for the Book of Allāh. The Companions often imparted verses to their tribes beyond the valley of Makkah, helping to secure firm roots in Madinah prior to their migration. For example:

- Upon the Prophet's arrival in Madinah he was presented with Zaid bin Thābit, a boy of eleven who had already memorized sixteen sūras.[39]

---

[30] *ibid*, vol. 1-2, p. 427.

[31] *ibid*, vol. 1-2, p. 427.

[32] *ibid*, vol. 1-2, p. 427.

[33] Al-Kattānī, *at-Tarātīb al-Idārīya*, i:43-4.

[34] Ibn Wahb, *al-Jāmiʿ fī ʿulūm al-Qurʾān*, p. 271. These are sūras no. 10, 20 and 76 respectively.

[35] Ibn Hishām, *Sīra*, vol. 1-2, p. 369.

[36] Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, iii/1:107; Ibn Isḥāq, *as-Seyar wa al-Maghāzī*, ed. by Zakkār, p. 186.

[37] Ibn Isḥāq, *as-Seyar wa al-Maghāzī*, ed. by Zakkār, pp. 181-84.

[38] Ibn Hishām, *Sīra*, vol. 1-2, p. 434.

[39] Al-Ḥākim, *al-Mustadrak*, iii:476.

- Barāʾ states that he was familiar with the entire *Mufaṣṣal* (المفصّل: from *Sūra Qāf* till the end of the Qurʾān) before the Prophet's arrival in Madinah.[40]

These roots soon blossomed in various mosques, whose walls echoed with the sound of the Qurʾān being taught and read before the Prophet had set foot in Madinah. According to al-Wāqidī, the first mosque honored by recitation of the Qurʾān was the Masjid of Banī Zuraiq.[41]

3. The Madanī Period

i. The Prophet as Teacher

- Arriving in Madinah the Prophet set up the Ṣuffa, a school dedicated to instructing its attendees in the skills of literacy, providing them with food and a place to sleep as well. Approximately 900 Companions took up this offer.[42] While the Prophet imparted the Qurʾān, others such as ʿAbdullāh bin Saʿīd bin al-ʿĀṣ, ʿUbāda bin aṣ-Ṣāmit, and Ubayy bin Kaʿb taught the essentials of reading and writing.[43]
- Ibn ʿUmar once remarked, "The Prophet would recite to us, and if he read a verse containing a *sajda* [سجدة: prostration], he would say 'Allāhu Akbar' [and prostrate]".[44]
- Numerous Companions stated that the Prophet recited such and such sūras to them personally, including renowned personalities like Ubayy bin Kaʿb, ʿAbdullāh bin Salām, Hishām bin Ḥakīm, ʿUmar bin al-Khaṭṭāb, and Ibn Masʿūd.[45]
- Deputations arriving from outlying areas were given into Madinite custody, not only for the provisions of food and lodging but also for education. The Prophet would subsequently question them to discover the extent of their learning.[46]
- Upon receiving any *waḥy*, the Prophet observed a habit of immediately reciting the latest verses to all the men in his company, proceeding afterwards to recite them to the women in a separate gathering.[47]

---

[40] Ibn Saʿd, *Ṭabaqāt*, iv/2:82.

[41] An-Nuwairī, *Nihāyatul Arab*, xvi:312.

[42] Al-Kattānī, *at-Tarātīb al-Idārīya*, i:476-80. According to Qatāda (61-117 A.H.) the number of pupils reached nine hundred, while other scholars mention four hundred.

[43] Al-Baihaqī, *Sunan*, vi:125-126.

[44] Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, Masājid:104.

[45] See aṭ-Ṭabarī, *at-Tafsīr*, 1:24; and other references besides.

[46] Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, iv:206.

[47] Ibn Isḥāq, *as-Seyar wa al-Maghāzī*, ed. by Zakkār, p. 147.

4. The Fruit of Educational Policy: The Ḥuffāẓ

The sea of incentives and opportunities for learning the Holy Book, coupled with the waves of people involved in disseminating it, soon yielded a prodigious number of Companions who had thoroughly memorized it by heart (the *ḥuffāẓ*). Many were subsequently martyred on the fields of Yamāmah and Bi'r Ma'ūnah, and the full details of their names have, in most cases, been lost to history. What the references do show are the names of those who lived on, who continued to teach either in Madinah or in the newly conquered lands of the growing Muslim realms. They include: Ibn Mas'ūd,[62] Abū Ayyūb,[63] Abū Bakr aṣ-Ṣiddīq,[64] Abū ad-Dardā',[65] Abū Zaid,[66] Abū Mūsā al-Ash'arī,[67] Abū Huraira,[68] Ubayy b. Ka'b,[69] Um-Salama,[70] Tamīm ad-Darī,[71] Ḥudhaifa,[72] Ḥafṣa,[73] Zaid b. Thābit,[74] Sālim client of Ḥudhaifa,[75] Sa'd b. 'Ubāda,[76] Sa'd b. 'Ubaid al-Qārī,[77] Sa'd b. Mundhir,[78] Shihāb al-Qurashī,[79] Ṭalḥa,[80] 'Ā'isha,[81] 'Ubāda b. aṣ-Ṣāmit,[82] 'Abdullāh b. Ṣā'ib,[83] Ibn 'Abbās,[84] 'Abdullāh b. 'Umar,[85] 'Abdullāh b. 'Amr,[86] 'Uthmān b. 'Affān,[87] 'Aṭā' b. Markayūd (a Persian, living in Yemen),[88] 'Uqba b. 'Āmir,[89] 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib,[90] 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb,[91] 'Amr b. al-'Āṣ,[92] Fuḍāla b. 'Ubaid,[93] Qays b. Abī Ṣa'ṣa'a,[94] Mujamma' b. Jārīya,[95] Maslama b. Makhlad,[96] Mu'ādh b. Jabal,[97] Mu'ādh Abū Ḥalima,[98] Um-Warqah bint 'Abdullāh b. al-Ḥārith,[99] and 'Abdul Wāḥid.[100]

5. Conclusion

History has not always dealt kindly with Scriptures. Jesus' original Gospel, as we shall see later on, was irretrievably lost in its infancy and replaced by the biographical works of anonymous writers lacking any first-hand knowledge of their subject; likewise the OT suffered heavily under chronic idolatry and neglect. There can be no sharper contrast than the Qur'ān, blessed as it was with rapid diffusion throughout the Arabian Peninsula during the Prophet's lifetime, carried forth by Companions who had learned its verses, and received their teaching commissions, directly from the Messenger himself. The vast number of *ḥuffāẓ* stands testament to his success. But was this dissemination purely verbal? We have noted that compiling the Qur'ān in written form was one of the Prophet's primary concerns; how then did he accomplish this task? These questions are the focus of our next chapter.

---

[62] Adh-Dhahabī, *Seyar al-'Alām an-Nubalā'*, ii:245; Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:52.

[63] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:53.

[64] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:52; al-Kattānī, *at-Tarātīb al-Idāriya*, i:45-6.

[65] Ibn Ḥabīb, *al-Muḥabbar*, p. 286; an-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, p. 27; ad-Dūlābī, *al-Kunā*, i:31-2; al-Kattānī, *at-Tarātīb al-Idārīya*, i:46.

[66] Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ii/2:112.

[67] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:52.

[68] Al-Kattānī, *at-Tarātīb al-Idārīya*, i:45; Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:52.

[69] Al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, ḥadīth nos. 5003, 5004; Ibn Ḥabīb, *al-Muḥabbar*, p. 86; an-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, p. 27; adh-Dhahabī, *Ṭabaqāt al-Qurrā'*, p. 9.

[70] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:52, quoting Abū 'Ubaid.

[71] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:52.

[72] Al-Kattānī, *at-Tarātīb al-Idārīya*, i:45; Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:52.

[73] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:52; as-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān*, i:202.

[74] Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, ii/2:112; al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, ḥadīth no. 5003, 5004; Ibn Ḥabīb, *al-Muḥabbar*, p. 86; an-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, p. 27; adh-Dhahabī, *Seyar al-'Alām an-Nubalā'*, ii:245, 318.

[75] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:52; al-Kattānī, *at-Tarātīb al-Idārīya*, i:45.

[76] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:52.

[77] Ibn Ḥabīb, *al-Muḥabbar*, p. 286; al-Ḥākim, *Mustadrak*, ii:260; an-Nadīm, *al-F - hrist*, p. 27; adh-Dhahabī, *Ṭabaqāt al-Qurrā'*, p. 15; Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:52; as-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān*, i:202.

[78] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:53.

[79] Ibn Ḥajar, *al-Iṣāba*, ii:159; al-Kattānī, *at-Tarātīb al-Idārīya*, i:46.

[80] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:52; al-Kattānī, *at-Tarātīb al-Idārīya*, i:45.

[81] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:52; as-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān*, i:202.

[82] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:52-53.

[83] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:52; al-Kattānī, *at-Tarātīb al-Idārīya*, i:45.

[84] Ibn Kathīr, *Faḍā'il al-Qur'ān*, pp. 7, 471; Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:52.

[85] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:52; as-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān*, i:202; adh-Dhahabī, *Ṭabaqāt al-Qurrā'*, p. 19.

[86] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:52.

[87] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:52; adh-Dhahabī, *Ṭabaqāt al-Qurrā'*, p. 5.

[88] Ibn Ḥibbān, *Thiqāt*, p. 286; ar-Rāzī, *Tārīkh Madīnat Ṣan'ā'*, p. 337.

[89] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:52; as-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān*, i:203; adh-Dhahabī, *Ṭabaqāt al-Qurrā'*, p. 19.

[90] An-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, p. 27; Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:13, 52; adh-Dhahabī, *Ṭabaqāt al-Qurrā'*, p. 7; al-Kattānī, *at-Tarātīb al-Idārīya*, i:45; as-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān*, i:202.

[91] Al-Kattānī, *at-Tarātīb al-Idārīya*, i:45; Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:52; as-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān*, i:202; See also Ibn Wahb, *al-Jāmi' fī 'ulūm al-Qur'ān*, p. 280.

[92] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:52.

[93] As-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān*, i:202; Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:52.

[94] As-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān*, i:203; Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:52.

[95] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:52; al-Kattānī, *at-Tarātīb al-Idārīya*, i:46.

[96] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:52; as-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān*, i:202.

[97] Al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, ḥadīth nos. 5003, 5004; Ibn Ḥabīb, *al-Muḥabbar*, p. 286; adh-Dhahabī, *Ṭabaqāt al-Qurrā'*, p. 19; an-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, p. 27; Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:53.

[98] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:52.

[99] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:52; as-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān*, i:203-4; al-Kattānī, *at-Tarātīb al-Idārīya*, i:47.

[100] Ibn Wahb, *al-Jāmi' fī 'ulūm al-Qur'ān*, p. 263. He disputed with Ibn Mas'ūd in reciting certain words.

Makkah,[2] a statement echoed by az-Zuhrī.[3] ʿAbdullāh b. Saʿd b. Abī aṣ-Ṣarḥ, the one scribe officially engaged in recording the Qur'ān during this period,[4] is accused by some of fabricating a few verses in the Qur'ān—accusations which I have exposed elsewhere as baseless.[5] Another candidate for official scribe is Khālid b. Saʿīd b. al-ʿĀṣ, who states, "I was the first to write down *'Bismillāh ar-Raḥmān ar-Raḥīm'* [بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم: In the Name of Allāh, Most Compassionate, Most Merciful]".[6]

Al-Kattānī cites this incident: when Rāfiʿ b. Mālik al-Anṣārī attended al-ʿAqaba, the Prophet handed him all the verses that had been revealed during the previous decade. Once back in Madinah, Rāfiʿ gathered his tribe together and read these pages to them.[7]

2. During the Madanī Period

i. Scribes of the Prophet

Regarding the Madanī period we have a wealth of information including, at present, the names of approximately sixty-five Companions who functioned as scribes for the Prophet at one time or another:

Abān b. Saʿīd, Abū Umāma, Abū Ayyūb al-Anṣārī, Abū Bakr aṣ-Ṣiddīq, Abū Ḥudhaifa, Abū Sufyān, Abū Salama, Abū ʿAbas, Ubayy b. Kaʿb, al-Arqam, Usaid b. al-Ḥuḍair, Aus, Buraida, Bashīr, Thābit b. Qais, Jaʿfar b. Abī Ṭālib, Jahm b. Saʿd, Juhaim, Ḥāṭib, Ḥudhaifa, Ḥuṣain, Ḥanẓala, Ḥuwaiṭib, Khālid b. Saʿīd, Khālid b. al-Walīd, az-Zubair b. al-ʿAwwām, Zubair b. Arqam, Zaid b. Thābit, Saʿd b. ar-Rabīʿ, Saʿd b. ʿUbāda, Saʿīd b. Saʿīd, Shuraḥbīl b. Ḥasna, Ṭalḥa, ʿĀmir b. Fuhaira, ʿAbbās, ʿAbdullāh b. al-Arqam, ʿAbdullāh b. Abī Bakr, ʿAbdullāh b. Khaṭl, ʿAbdullāh b. Rawāḥa, ʿAbdullāh b. Zaid, ʿAbdullāh b. Saʿd, ʿAbdullāh b. ʿAbdullāh, ʿAbdullāh b. ʿAmr, ʿUthmān b. ʿAffān, ʿUqba, al-ʿAlā' al-Ḥaḍramī, al-ʿAlā' b. ʿUqba, ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib, ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, ʿAmr b. al-ʿĀṣ, Muḥammad b. Maslama, Muʿādh b. Jabal, Muʿāwiya, Maʿn b. ʿAdī, Muʿaiqīb, Mughīra, Mundhir, Muhājir and Yazīd b. Abī Sufyān.[8]

---

[2] Ibn Ḍurais, *Faḍā'il al-Qur'ān*, p. 33.

[3] Az-Zuhrī, *Tanzīl al-Qur'ān*, 32; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya*, v:340; Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:22.

[4] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:22.

[5] For details see M.M. al-Aʿẓamī, *Kuttāb an-Nabī*, 3rd edition, Riyāḍ, 1401 (1981), pp. 83-89.

[6] As-Suyūṭī, *ad-Durr al-Manthūr*, i:11. The printed text gives his name as Khālid b. Khālid b. Saʿīd, likely the mistake of a previous copyist.

[7] Al-Kattānī, *at-Tarātīb al-Idārīya*, i:44, quoting Zubair b. Bakkār, *Akhbār al-Madīna*.

[8] For a detailed study, see, M.M. al-Aʿẓamī, *Kuttāb an-Nabī*.

ii. The Prophet's Dictation of the Qur'ān

Upon the descent of *waḥy*, the Prophet routinely called for one of his scribes to write down the latest verses.[9] Zaid b. Thābit narrates that, because of his proximity to the Prophet's Mosque, he was often summoned as scribe whenever the *waḥy* commenced.[10] When the verse pertaining to *jihād* (جهاد) was revealed, the Prophet called on Zaid b. Thābit with inkpot and writing material (board or scapula bone) and began dictating; ʿAmr b. Um-Maktūm al-Aʿmā, sitting nearby, inquired of the Prophet, "What about me? for I am blind". And so came, «غير أولي الضرر»[11] ("for those who are not among the disabled").[12] There is also evidence of proofreading after dictation; once the task of recording the verses was complete, Zaid would read them back to the Prophet to ensure that no scribal errors had crept in.[13]

iii. Recording the Qur'ān was Common Practice Among Companions

Spurred by the prevalence of recording activity among the Companions, the Prophet declared that no one should record anything from him save for the Qur'ān, "and whoever has written anything from me other than the Qur'ān should erase it".[14] By this he meant that Qur'ānic and non-Qur'ānic (*e.g. ḥadīth*) materials must not be written on the same sheet, so as to avoid any confusion. In fact those who were unable to write often appeared in the Mosque, vellum and parchment in hand, requesting volunteers who might record for them.[15] Based on the total number of scribes, and the Prophet's custom of summoning them to record all new verses, we can safely assume that in his own lifetime the entire Qur'ān was available in written form.

---

[9] Abū ʿUbaid, *Faḍā'il*, p. 280; See also Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:22, quoting ʿUthmān, referring to *Sunan* of at-Tirmidhī, an-Nasā'ī, Abū Dāwūd, and al-Ḥākim in his *al-Mustadrak*.

[10] Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *al-Maṣāḥif*, p. 3; see also al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, Faḍā'il al-Qur'ān:4.

[11] Qur'ān 4:95.

[12] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:22; as-Sāʿātī, *Minḥat al-Maʿbūd*, ii:17.

[13] Aṣ-Ṣūlī, *Adab al-Kuttāb*, p. 165; al-Haithamī, *Majmaʿ az-Zawā'id*, i:152.

[14] Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, az-Zuhd:72; also Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *al-Maṣāḥif*, p. 4. For a detailed discussion see M.M. al-Aʿẓamī, *Studies in Early Hadith Literature*, American Trust Publications, Indiana, 1978, pp. 22-24.

[15] See al-Baihaqī, *Sunan al-Kubrā*, vi:16.

3. The Arrangement of the Qur'ān

i. The Arrangement of Verses Within Sūras

It is commonly acknowledged that the arrangement of *āyāt* (آيات: verses) and *sūras* (سُوَر: chapters) in the Qur'ān is unique. The layout does not follow the chronological order of revelation, nor does it follow subject matter. What secret lies behind this arrangement is best known to Allāh, for it is His Book. Now if I play the unscrupulous editor and re-arrange the words of someone else's book, by changing the sequence of the sentences etc., then altering the entire meaning of the work becomes tremendously easy. This end product can no longer be attributed to the original author, since only the author himself is entitled to change the wording and the material if the rightful claim of authorship is to be preserved.

So it is with the Book of Allāh, for He is the sole Author and He alone has the right to arrange the material within His Book. The Qur'ān is very clear about this:

﴿ إِنَّ عَلَيْنَا جَمْعَهُۥ وَقُرْءَانَهُۥ ﴿١٧﴾ فَإِذَا قَرَأْنَٰهُ فَٱتَّبِعْ قُرْءَانَهُۥ ﴿١٨﴾ ثُمَّ إِنَّ عَلَيْنَا
بَيَانَهُۥ ﴿١٩﴾ ﴾[16]

> "It is for Us to collect it [in your heart] so you may recite [and compile it]. But when We have recited it, follow its recital [as promulgated]: Nay more, it is for Us to explain it [through your tongue]."

In lieu of descending to earth to explain His verses, Allāh entrusted the Prophet as His viceroy. The Qur'ān states:

﴿ وَأَنزَلْنَآ إِلَيْكَ ٱلذِّكْرَ لِتُبَيِّنَ لِلنَّاسِ مَا نُزِّلَ إِلَيْهِمْ ﴾[17]

---

[16] Qur'ān 75:16-19. These verses should be read while keeping in mind aṭ-Ṭabarī's commentary in his *Tafsīr*, vol. 29, p. 189. The Arabic word *Jam'ahu* (جمعه) has different meanings. *Jam'a* (جمع) means memorization, and also to collect and compile. Aṭ-Ṭabarī quotes Qatāda (*d.* 117 A.H.) as saying: "In this verse, *Jam'ahu* means compilation." Ma'mar b. al-Muthannā at-Tamīmī (110-210 A.H.) explained the meaning of the verse إن علينا جمعه وقرآنه as: "It is on Us to compile by means of connecting one piece to another" (أي تأليف بعضه إلى بعض) [Abū 'Ubaidah, *Majāz al-Qur'ān*, p. 18, see also p. 2]. When al-Qifṭī (*d.* 646 A.H./1248 C.E.) compiled his work *Inbah ar-Ruwāt*, he wrote: مما عني بجمعه in the sense 'compiled by.' [Quoted by Fuat Sezgin (ed.), *Majāz al-Qur'ān*, Introduction, p. 31].

[17] Qur'ān 75:16-19. These verses should be read while keeping in mind aṭ-Ṭabarī's commentary in his *Tafsīr*, vol. 29, p. 189. The Arabic word *Jam'ahu* (جمعه) has different meanings. *Jam'a* (جمع) means memorization, and also to collect and compile. Aṭ-Ṭabarī quotes Qatāda (*d.* 117 A.H.) as saying: "In this verse, *Jam'ahu* means compilation." Ma'mar b. al-Muthannā at-Tamīmī (110-210 A.H.) explained the meaning of the verse إن علينا جمعه

> "... and We have sent down unto you the Message [O Muḥammad]; that you may explain clearly to people what is sent for them."

In granting him this privilege, Allāh was sanctioning the Prophet's explanations as authoritative.[18] Only the Prophet, through divine privilege and revelation, was qualified to arrange verses into the unique fashion of the Qur'ān, being the only privy to the Will of the Creator. Neither the Muslim community at large nor anyone else had any legitimate say in organizing the Book of Allāh.

The Qur'ān consists of sūras of uneven length; the shortest contain three verses while the longest has 286. Various reports show that the Prophet actively instructed his scribes about the placement of verses within sūras. 'Uthmān states that whether the revelation consisted of lengthy, successive verses, or a single verse in isolation, the Prophet would summon one of his scribes and say, "Place this verse [or these verses] in the sūra where such-and-such is mentioned".[19] Zaid bin Thābit remarks,

عن زيد بن ثابت، قال: كنّا عند رسول الله ﷺ نؤلّف القرآن من الرقاع.

> "We, in the presence of the Prophet, would compile the Qur'ān from pieces of parchment."[20]

Further testimony for verse arrangement is given by the narrations below, some of which also cite the role of the Archangel Jibrīl in this regard.

- 'Uthmān bin Abī al-'Āṣ reports that he was sitting with the Prophet when the latter fixed his gaze upon a definite point, then said, "The Archangel Jibrīl has just come to me and expressly asked me to place the verse:

  ﴿ إِنَّ ٱللَّهَ يَأْمُرُ بِٱلْعَدْلِ وَٱلْإِحْسَٰنِ وَإِيتَآيِٕ ذِى ٱلْقُرْبَىٰ وَيَنْهَىٰ عَنِ ٱلْفَحْشَآءِ
  وَٱلْمُنكَرِ وَٱلْبَغْىِ ۚ يَعِظُكُمْ لَعَلَّكُمْ تَذَكَّرُونَ ﴿٩٠﴾ ﴾[21]

وقرآنه as: "It is on Us to compile by means of connecting one piece to another" (أي تأليف بعضه إلى بعض) [Abū 'Ubaidah, *Majāz al-Qur'ān*, p. 18, see also p. 2]. When al-Qifṭī (*d.* 646 A.H./1248 C.E.) compiled his work *Inbah ar-Ruwāt*, he wrote: مما عني بجمعه in the sense 'compiled by.' [Quoted by Fuat Sezgin (ed.), *Majāz al-Qur'ān*, Introduction, p. 31].

[18] As mentioned previously, in this light the Prophet's *sunna* – which is in fact a working explanation of the Qur'ān – has also been practically and verbally sanctioned by Allāh, with no one possessing the authority to deny it its rightful place.

[19] See at-Tirmidhī, *Sunan*, no. 3086; also al-Baihaqī, ii:42; Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, i:69; Abū Dāwūd, *Sunan*, i:290; al-Ḥākim, *al-Mustadrak*, i:221; Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:22; see also Abū 'Ubaid, *Faḍā'il*, p. 280.

[20] See at-Tirmidhī, *Sunan*, Manāqib:141, no. 3954; Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, v:185; al-Ḥākim, *al-Mustadrak*, ii:229.

[21] Qur'ān 16:90.

in a certain position within a particular sūra."[22]

- Al-Kalbī narrates from Abū Ṣāliḥ on Ibn ʿAbbās' authority regarding the verse:

  ﴿ وَٱتَّقُوا۟ يَوْمًا تُرْجَعُونَ فِيهِ إِلَى ٱللَّهِ ﴾[23]

  He states, "This was the last verse revealed to the Prophet. The Archangel Jibrīl descended on him and instructed him to place it after verse two hundred and eighty in *Sūra al-Baqara*."[24]
- Ubayy bin Kaʿb states, "Sometimes the beginning of a sūra is revealed to the Prophet, so I write it down, then another revelation descends upon him so he says, 'Ubayy! write this down in the sūra where such-and-such is mentioned.' At other times a revelation descends upon him and I await his instructions, till he informs me of its rightful place."[25]
- Zaid bin Thābit remarks, "While we were with the Prophet compiling the Qur'ān from parchments, he said, 'Blessed be the Shām.'[26] He was asked, 'Why so, O Prophet of Allāh?' He replied, 'Because the angels of the Most Compassionate (الرحمن) have spread their wings upon it."[27] In this *ḥadīth* we again note that the Prophet was supervising the compilation and arrangement of verses.
- Finally we have the clearest evidence of all, that of reciting sūras in the five daily prayers. No public recital can occur if the sequence of verses has not been universally agreed upon, and there is no known incident of a congregation disagreeing with its imām on his sequence of verses, whether in the Prophet's era or our own. In fact, the Prophet would occasionally recite entire sūras during the Jumuʿa (Friday) sermon as well.[28]

Further support is given by numerous *ḥadīths* which demonstrate that the Companions were familiar with the beginning and end points of sūras.

- The Prophet remarked to ʿUmar, "The concluding verses of *Sūra an-Nisā'* would alone be sufficient for you [in resolving certain cases of inheritance]."[29]

---

[22] Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, iv:218, no. 17947; see also as-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān*, i:173.

[23] Qur'ān 2:281.

[24] Al-Bāqillānī, *al-Intiṣār*, p. 176.

[25] *ibid*, p. 176.

[26] Shām is the name given to present-day Syria, Jordan, Lebanon and Palestine.

[27] Al-Bāqillānī, *al-Intiṣār*, pp. 176-7.

[28] Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, Jumuʿa:52.

[29] Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, al-Farā'iḍ:9.

- Abū Masʿūd al-Badrī reports that the Prophet said, "The final two verses from *Sūra al-Baqara* will suffice for whoever recites them at night."[30]
- Ibn ʿAbbās recalls, "Spending the night in my aunt Maimūna's house [wife of the Prophet], I heard the Prophet stirring up from his sleep and reciting the final ten verses from *Sūra Āli-ʿImrān*."[31]

ii. The Arrangement of Sūras

Some references allege that the Muṣḥafs (مصاحف: compiled copies of the Qur'ān)[32] used by Ubayy bin Kaʿb and Ibn Masʿūd exhibited discrepancies in their arrangement of sūras, as compared to the universal norm. But nowhere do we find any reference to a disagreement in the ordering of verses within a particular sūra. The Qur'ān's unique format allows each sūra to function as an independent unit; no chronology or narrative carries over from one to the next, and therefore any change in the sequence of sūras is purely superficial. Such were these discrepancies, if indeed they did exist, that the message of the Qur'ān remained inviolate. Variations in word order or the sequence of verses would be a different matter altogether—a profound alteration that thankfully not even the best-known variant Muṣḥafs can make claims to.

Scholars unanimously agree that to follow the sūra order in the Qur'ān is not compulsory, whether in prayer, recitation, learning, teaching or memorization.[33] Each sūra stands alone, and the latter ones do not necessarily possess greater legal bearing than their earlier counterparts; sometimes a *mansūkh* (منسوخ: abrogated) verse appears in a sūra that is subsequent to the sūra containing the verse that replaces it. Most Muslims begin memorizing the Qur'ān from the end, beginning with the shortest sūras (nos. 114, 113, ...) and working backwards. The Prophet once recited the *Sūras* of *al-Baqara*, *an-Nisā'* then *Āli-ʿImrān* (sūras no. 2, 4 and 3, respectively) within a single rakʿa (ركعة),[34] contrary to their order of appearance in the Qur'ān.

As far as I am aware, there are no *ḥadīths* in which the Prophet delineates the order of all the sūras. Opinions differ, and can be summarized as follows:

1. The arrangement of all the sūras, as it stands, harkens back to the Prophet himself.[35] This is the opinion that I subscribe to. The

---

[30] Al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, Faḍā'il al-Qur'ān:10.

[31] Al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, al-Wuḍū':37; Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, Musāfirīn, no. 182. For details see Muslim, *Kitāb at-Tamyīz*, edited by M.M. al-Aʿẓamī, pp. 183-5.

[32] Literally a collection of sheets, here meaning sheets of parchment containing the Qur'ān. See p. 91.

[33] Al-Bāqillānī, *al-Intiṣār*, p. 167.

[34] Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, Musāfirīn, no. 203.

[35] See as-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān*, i:176-77; see also Abū Dāwūd, *Sunan*, no. 786.

counterview disagrees with this, citing that the Muṣḥafs of certain Companions (such as Ibn Mas'ūd and Ubayy b. Ka'b) supposedly differed in sūra order from the Muṣḥaf presently in our hands.[36]

2. Some believe that the entire Qur'ān was arranged by the Prophet except for sūra no. 9, which was placed by 'Uthmān.[37]
3. Another view credits the arrangement of all sūras to Zaid b. Thābit, Caliph 'Uthmān and the Prophet's Companions. Al-Bāqillānī adheres to this notion.[38]
4. Ibn 'Aṭīyya supports the view that the Prophet arranged some of the sūras while the rest were arranged by the Companions.[39]

iii. The Arrangement of Sūras in Some Partial Muṣḥafs

Muslim scholarly opinion unanimously holds that the present arrangement of sūras is identical to that of 'Uthmān's Muṣḥaf.[40] Anyone desiring to copy the Qur'ān in its entirety has to follow that sequence, but for those who seek to copy only particular sūras, following the arrangement outlined in 'Uthmān's Muṣḥaf is no longer necessary. An analogous situation occurs when I travel by air: I like to take my work with me but, not wanting to carry bulky volumes in my suitcase, I simply photocopy those portions that I need during my trip.

In the early days Muṣḥafs were scribed on parchment of course, usually much heavier than paper, so that a full Muṣḥaf may have weighed a few kilograms. And we have many examples (for instance the Yemenī collection; see Figures 5.1-5.2) where the Qur'ān is written in such large calligraphy that an entire Muṣḥaf's thickness would easily exceed one meter.

Taking the Muṣḥaf printed by the King Fahd complex in Madinah as a standard, we find that it contains some six hundred pages (approximately 9,000 lines). Interestingly, the entire text of the parchment in Figure 5.2 is half a line in the Muṣḥaf printed at Madinah, meaning that an entire Muṣḥaf written on that scale would require 18,000 pages. Voluminous calligraphy is by no means rare, but it does generally indicate that the Muṣḥaf consisted of no more than a handful of sūras. Library shelves throughout the world are filled with partially written Qur'āns; listed below are a few dozen examples from just a single library, the Salar Jung Museum[41] in Hyderabad, India.

---

[36] See Chapter 14, which is specially devoted to the Muṣḥaf of Ibn Mas'ūd.

[37] As-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān*, i:177, quoting al-Baihaqī, *Madkhal*; see also Abū Dāwūd, *Sunan*, no. 786.

[38] Al-Bāqillānī, *al-Intiṣār*, p. 166.

[39] Ibn 'Aṭīyya, *al-Muḥarrar al-Wajīz*, i:34-35.

[40] See Chapter 7.

[41] Muhammad Ashraf, *A Catalogue of Arabic Manuscripts in Salar Jung Museum & Library*, pp. 166-234.

Figure 5.1: A parchment from the Yemenī collection. Dimensions are ~ 18×13 cm. Courtesy: National Archive Museum of Yemen.

Figure 5.2: Another parchment from the Yemenī collection. Dimensions are ~ 13×8 cm. Courtesy: National Archive Museum of Yemen

MS No.	No. of sūras	Order of sūras	Date[42]
244	29	36, 48, 55, 56, 62, 67, 75, 76, 78, 93, 94, 72, 97 and 99–114	*c.* Early 11th
246	16	62 (first 8 āyahs only), 110, 1, 57, 113, 56, 94, 114, 64, 48, 47, 89, 112, 36, 78 and 67	*c.* An early 10th, and late 11th century copy
247	10	1, 36, 48, 56, 67, 78, 109 and 112–114	
248	9	73, 51, 67, 55, 62, 109 and 112–114	1076 A.H. (1666 C.E.)
249	9	17, 18, 37, 44, 50, 69, 51, 89 and 38	1181 A.H. (1767 C.E.)
250	9	20, 21, 22, 63 and 24–28	*c.* Early 12th
251	8	6, 36, 48, 56, 62, 67, 76 and 78	*c.* Early 11th
252	8	1, 6, 18, 34, 35, 56, 67 and 78	*c.* Early 11th
255	8	1, 36, 48, 55, 67, 73, 56 and 78	*c.* Early 14th
253	8	36, 48, 56, 62, 67, 71, 73 and 78	*c.* Late 11th
254	7	1, 55, 56, 62, 68, 73 and 88	*c.* Late 12th
256	7	36, 48, 78, 56, 67, 55 and 73	*c.* Early 11th
257	7	36, 48, 78, 67, 56, 73 and 62	*c.* Mid 11th
258	7	18, 32, 36, 48, 56, 67 and 78	*c.* Late 11th
259	7	18, 36, 37, 48, 56, 67 and 78	*c.* Late 11th
260	7	36, 48, 56, 67, 78, 55 and 62	*c.* Late 12th
261	7	36, 48, 78, 56, 67, 55 and 73	*c.* Late 13th
262	6	1, 36, 48, 56, 67 and 78	1115 A.H. (1704 C.E.)
263	6[43]	36, 48, 55, 56, 67 and 68	
264	6[44]	1, 36, 48, 56, 78 and 67	1278 A.H. (1862 C.E.)
265	6	18, 36, 71, 78, 56 and 67	*c.* Early 10th
266	6	36, 55, 56, 62, 63 and 78	*c.* Late 13th
267	5	36, 48, 56, 67 and 78	989 A.H. (1581 C.E.)
268	5	36, 48, 56, 67 and 78	1075 A.H. (1664 C.E.)
270	5	36, 48, 56, 67 and 78	1104 A.H. (1692 C.E.)
271	5	36, 48, 67, 72 and 78	1106 A.H. (1694 C.E.)
272	5	36, 48, 56, 67 and 78	1198 A.H. (1783 C.E.)
273	5	36, 48, 55, 56 and 67	1200 A.H. (1786 C.E.)
275	5	36, 78, 48, 56 and 67	1237 A.H.
279	5	36, 48, 56, 67 and 78	626 A.H. (1228 C.E.)[45]
280	5	1, 6, 18, 34 and 35	1084 A.H. (1673 C.E.)
281	5	36, 48, 56, 59 and 62	*c.* Early 10th
282	5	1, 6, 18, 34 and 35	*c.* Early 10th
284	5	6, 36, 48, 56 and 67	*c.* Late 10th
296	5	18, 36, 44, 67 and 78	*c.* Early 12th
308	4	6, 18, 34 and 35	*c.* Early 9th
310	4	6–9	*c.* Early 12th

We can conclude that anyone desiring to scribe a partial Muṣḥaf would have felt at liberty to place the sūras in whichever order he saw fit.

4. Conclusion

By understanding the need to document every verse, the Muslim community (already swelling with the ranks of the *ḥuffāẓ*) was setting up both an aid to memorization, and a barrier to shield the text from corruptive influences. Even the grind of Makkan oppression could not dampen this resolve, and when the Muslims at last enjoyed the prosperity of Madinah the entire nation, literate and illiterate alike, took this task to heart. At the center of this nation resided its energizing focal point, the final Messenger, dictating, explaining, and arranging every verse through the divine inspiration which was his privilege alone, till all the pieces were in place and the Book was complete. How the sacred text fared after the Prophet's death, and how the nation shunned complacency and exerted renewed efforts to ensure the Qur'ān's integrity, are the focuses of our next chapter.

---

[42] Some Muṣḥafs have the scribing date written on them, while others are undated. For the latter, I have copied the approximate date (A.H.) as per the catalogue and preceded it with the circa symbol.

[43] Six sūras with some supplications in accordance with the Shiite creed.

[44] In addition to some supplications in accordance with the Shiite creed.

[45] This Muṣḥaf is copied by Yāqūt al-Mustaʿṣimī.

CHAPTER SIX

THE WRITTEN COMPILATION OF THE QUR'ĀN

Though the Prophet enlisted all possible measures to preserve the Qur'ān, he did not bind all the sūras together into one master volume, as evidenced by Zaid bin Thābit's statement that,

«قُبض النبي ﷺ ولم يكن القرآن جُمع في شيء»[1]

> "The Prophet was taken [from this life] whilst the Qur'ān had not yet been collected into a book."

Note the usage of 'collected' rather than 'written'. Commenting on this al-Khaṭṭābī says, "This quote refers to [the lack of] a specific book with specific traits. The Qur'ān had indeed been written down in its entirety during the Prophet's lifetime, but had not been collected together nor were the sūras arranged".[2]

Setting up a master volume might have proved challenging. Any divine *naskh* (نسخ: abrogation) revealed subsequently, affecting the legal provisions or wordings of certain verses, required proper inclusion. A loose page format also greatly simplified the insertion of new verses and new sūras, for the revelations did not cease until a short time before the Prophet's death. But with his death the *waḥy* ended forever: there would be no more verses, abrogations or rearrangements, so that the situation lent itself perfectly for the compilation of the Qur'ān into a single, unified volume. Prudence compelled the community to hasten in this task, and Allāh guided the Companions to serve the Qur'ān in such fashion as to fulfill His promise of forever preserving His Book,

﴿إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا ٱلذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُۥ لَحَٰفِظُونَ ۝٩﴾[3]

> "We have, without doubt, sent down the message; and We will assuredly guard it [from corruption]."

---

[1] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:12; see also al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, Jam'i al-Qur'ān, ḥadīth no. 4986.

[2] As-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān*, i:164.

[3] Qur'ān 15:9.

1. Compilation of the Qur'ān During Abū Bakr's Reign

i. Appointment of Zaid bin Thābit as Compiler of the Qur'ān

Zaid reports,

> Abū Bakr sent for me at a time when the Yamāmah battles had witnessed the martyrdom of numerous Companions. I found 'Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb with him. Abū Bakr began, "'Umar has just come to me and said, 'In the Yamāmah battles death has dealt most severely with the *qurrā'*,[4] and I fear it will deal with them with equal severity in other theatres of war. As a result much of the Qur'ān will be gone (يذهب القرآن). I am therefore of the opinion that you should command the Qur'ān be collected.'" Abū Bakr continued, "I said to 'Umar, 'How can we embark on what the Prophet never did?' 'Umar replied that it was a good deed regardless, and he did not cease replying to my scruples until Allāh reconciled me to the undertaking, and I became of the same mind as him. Zaid, you are young and intelligent, you used to record the revelations for the Prophet, and we know nothing to your discredit. So pursue the Qur'ān and collect it together." By Allāh, had they asked me to move a mountain it could not have been weightier than what they requested of me now. I asked them how they could undertake what the Prophet had never done, but Abū Bakr and 'Umar insisted that it was permissible and good. They did not cease replying to my scruples until Allāh reconciled me to the undertaking, the way Allāh had already reconciled Abū Bakr and 'Umar.[5]

On being convened Zaid accepted the momentous task of supervising the committee and 'Umar, who had proposed the project, agreed to lend his full assistance.[6]

---

[4] *Qurrā'* [literally: reciters] is another term for the *ḥuffāẓ*, those who had committed the entire Qur'ān to memory. The *qurrā'*, in their piety, always fought in the front lines during combat and hence suffered greater losses than other soldiers. There is no real consensus on the number of Muslims who were martyred at Yamāmah. One estimate puts the figure at 600 to 700 [al-Qurṭubī, *al-Jāmi' li Aḥkām al-Qur'ān*, i:50; also *ibid*, pp. 38-39], while Ibn Kathīr favors 450 [*al-Bidāya wa an-Nihāya*, vi:340]. In a recent book, M. al-'Askar compiled a list of 118 of those martyred at Yamāmah [*Shuhadā' Yaum al-Yamāmah (12/633)*, Riyāḍ, 1427 (2006)]. Most of the estimates mention seventy *qurrā'* martyred in the battle, Ibn Kathīr himself counts over 50 of them [*al-Bidāya wa an-Nihāya*, vi:334-40].

[5] Al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, Jam'i al-Qur'ān, ḥadīth no. 4986; see also Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *al-Maṣāḥif*, pp. 6-9.

[6] See Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *al-Maṣāḥif*, p. 6.

ii. Zaid bin Thābit's Credentials

In his early twenties at the time, Zaid had been privileged enough to live in the Prophet's neighborhood and serve as one of his most visible scribes. He was also among the *ḥuffāẓ*, and the breadth of these credentials made him an outstanding choice for this task. Abū Bakr aṣ-Ṣiddīq listed his qualifications in the narration above:

1. Zaid's youth (indicating vitality and energy).
2. His irreproachable morals. Abū Bakr specifically said «لا نتهمك»: "We do not accuse you of any wrongdoing".
3. His intelligence (indicating the necessary competence and awareness).
4. His prior experience with recording the *waḥy*.[7]
5. I may add one more point to his credit: Zaid was one of the fortunate few who attended the Archangel Jibrīl's recitations with the Prophet during Ramaḍān.[8]

iii. Abū Bakr's Instructions to Zaid bin Thābit

Let me quote a brief case brought before Abū Bakr while he was caliph. An elderly woman approached him asking for her share in the inheritance of her deceased grandson. He replied that the amount of a grandmother's share was not mentioned in the Qur'ān, nor did he recall the Prophet making any statements regarding this. Inquiring of those in attendance, he received an answer from al-Mughīra who, standing up, said he had been present when the Prophet stated that a grandmother's share was one-sixth. Abū Bakr asked if any others could corroborate al-Mughīra, to which Muḥammad bin Maslama testified in the affirmative. Carrying the matter beyond the realm of doubt meant that Abū Bakr had to request verification before acting on al-Mughīra's statement.[9] In this regard Abū Bakr (and subsequently 'Uthmān, as we shall see) were simply following the Qur'ān's edict concerning witnesses:

﴿ يَٰٓأَيُّهَا ٱلَّذِينَ ءَامَنُوٓاْ إِذَا تَدَايَنتُم بِدَيۡنٍ إِلَىٰٓ أَجَلٖ مُّسَمّٗى فَٱكۡتُبُوهُۚ وَلۡيَكۡتُب
بَّيۡنَكُمۡ كَاتِبُۢ بِٱلۡعَدۡلِۚ وَلَا يَأۡبَ كَاتِبٌ أَن يَكۡتُبَ كَمَا عَلَّمَهُ ٱللَّهُۚ فَلۡيَكۡتُبۡ
وَلۡيُمۡلِلِ ٱلَّذِي عَلَيۡهِ ٱلۡحَقُّ وَلۡيَتَّقِ ٱللَّهَ رَبَّهُۥ وَلَا يَبۡخَسۡ مِنۡهُ شَيۡـٔٗاۚ فَإِن كَانَ ٱلَّذِي

---

[7] See al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, Jam'i al-Qur'ān, ḥadīth no. 4986; also Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *al-Maṣāḥif*, p. 8.

[8] Ṭāhir al-Jazā'irī, *at-Tibyān*, p. 126; see also A. Jeffery (ed.), *al-Mabānī*, p. 25.

[9] Mālik, *al-Muwaṭṭa'*, al-Frā'iḍ:4, p. 513.

عَلَيْهِ ٱلْحَقُّ سَفِيهًا أَوْ ضَعِيفًا أَوْ لَا يَسْتَطِيعُ أَن يُمِلَّ هُوَ فَلْيُمْلِلْ وَلِيُّهُۥ بِٱلْعَدْلِ ۚ
وَٱسْتَشْهِدُوا۟ شَهِيدَيْنِ مِن رِّجَالِكُمْ ۖ فَإِن لَّمْ يَكُونَا رَجُلَيْنِ فَرَجُلٌ وَٱمْرَأَتَانِ مِمَّن
تَرْضَوْنَ مِنَ ٱلشُّهَدَآءِ أَن تَضِلَّ إِحْدَىٰهُمَا فَتُذَكِّرَ إِحْدَىٰهُمَا ٱلْأُخْرَىٰ ۚ وَلَا يَأْبَ
ٱلشُّهَدَآءُ إِذَا مَا دُعُوا۟ ﴾

"O you who have attained to faith! Whenever you give or take credit for a stated term, set it down in writing.... And call upon two of your men to act as witnesses; and if two men are not available, then a man and two women from among such as are acceptable to you as witnesses, so that if one of them should make a mistake, the other could remind her. And the witnesses must not refuse [to give evidence] whenever they are called upon."[10]

This law of witness played an essential role in the Qur'ān's compilation (as well as in *ḥadīth* methodology), and constituted the very core of Abū Bakr's instructions to Zaid. Ibn Ḥajar relates:

وعند ابن أبي داود أيضا عن طريق هشام بن عروة، عن أبيه، أن أبا بكر قال لعمر وزيد: أقعدا على باب المسجد فمَن جاءكما بشاهدين على شيء من كتاب الله فأكتباه.

Abū Bakr told 'Umar and Zaid, "Sit at the entrance to the [Prophet's] Mosque. If anyone brings you a verse from the Book of Allāh along with two witnesses, then record it".[11]

Ibn Ḥajar comments on what Abū Bakr may have meant by 'witness':

قال ابن حجر: «كأن المراد بالشاهدين الحفظ والكتاب، أو المراد أنهما يشهدان على أن ذلك المكتوب كتب بين يدي رسول الله ﷺ أو المراد أنهما يشهدان على أن ذلك من الوجوه التي نزل بها القرآن، وكان غرضهم أن لا يُكتب إلا من عين ما كُتب بين يدي النبي ﷺ لا من مجرد الحفظ»[12]

As if what is meant by two witnesses are memory [backed by] the written word. Or, two witnesses to testify that the verse was written verbatim in the Prophet's presence. Or, meaning they would testify that it was one of the forms in which the Qur'ān was revealed. Their intention was to accept only what had been written in the Prophet's presence, not [what had been penned] from memory.

---

[10] Qur'ān 2:282. The decree of substituting two women for one man may be due to the former's lesser fluency with general business procedures. See Muhammad Asad's translation of the Qur'ān, *Sūra* 2 footnote 273.

[11] Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *al-Maṣāḥif*, p. 6; see also Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:14.

[12] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:14-15.

The second opinion finds the most favor with me: acceptance of only those materials which, according to the sworn testimony of two others, had been written in the Prophet's very presence. Ibn Ḥajar's statement affirms this view, that "Zaid was unwilling to accept any written material for consideration unless two Companions bore witness that the man received his dictation from the Prophet himself".[13]

«حتى يشهد به مَن تلقّاه سماعاً»

According to Prof. Shauqī Ḍaif, Bilāl bin Rabāḥ paced the streets of Madinah requesting the attendance of any Companion who possessed verses recorded by the Prophet's own dictation.[14]

iv. How Zaid bin Thābit Utilized the Written Materials

The normal procedure in collating manuscripts is for the editor to compare different copies of the same work, though naturally not all copies will be of equal value. In outlining manuscript gradations, which are most dependable and which are worthless, Bergsträsser set out a few rules among the most important of which are:

1. Older copies are generally more reliable than newer ones.
2. Copies that were revised and corrected by the scribe, through comparison with the mother manuscript, are superior to those which lack this.[15]
3. If the original is extant, any copy scribed from this loses all significance.[16]

Blachère and Sauvaget reiterate this third point: should the author's original autograph exist, or a copy revised by the author, then the value of all other copies is negated.[17] Likewise, in the absence of the author's original, any duplicate whose mother copy is available is discarded.

Suppose that a manuscript's lineage follows the tree above. Consider these two scenarios:

- Assume that the original author only produced a single edition of his book. There were no second editions, or emendations to

---

[13] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:14. For the sources of collected materials, see al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, ḥadīth no. 4986.

[14] Shauqī Ḍaif, *Kitāb as-Sab'a of Ibn Mujāhid*, Introduction, p. 6.

[15] Bergsträsser, *Uṣūl Naqd an-Nuṣūṣ wa Nashr al-Kutub (in Arabic)*, Cairo, 1969, p. 14.

[16] *ibid*, p. 20.

[17] R. Blachère et J. Sauvaget, *Règles pour editions et traductions de textes arabes*. Arabic translation by al-Miqdād, p. 47.

person in Kūfa dictating the Holy Qur'ān to them solely by heart, 'Umar became furious to the point of madness. But discovering the culprit to be none other than Ibn Mas'ūd, and recalling his competence and abilities, he calmed down and regained his composure.

Significant information also exists about the spread of the Qur'ān in Syria. Yazīd bin Abī Sufyān, Syria's governor, described to 'Umar the Muslim masses requiring education in Qur'ān and Islamic matters, and appealed to him for instructors. Selecting three Companions for this mission – Mu'ādh, 'Ubāda, and Abū ad-Dardā' – 'Umar instructed them to proceed to Ḥimṣ where, after achieving their objectives, one of them would journey on to Damascus and another to Palestine. When this triumvirate was satisfied with its work in Ḥimṣ, Abū ad-Dardā' continued on to Damascus and Mu'ādh to Palestine, leaving 'Ubāda behind. Mu'ādh died soon afterwards, but Abū ad-Dardā' lived in Damascus for a long time and established a highly reputable circle, the students under his tutelage exceeding 1600.[27] Dividing his pupils into groups of ten, he assigned a separate instructor for each and made his rounds to check on their progress. Those passing this elementary level then came under his direct instruction, so that the more advanced students enjoyed the dual privileges of studying with Abū ad-Dardā' and functioning as intermediary teachers.[28]

The same method was applied elsewhere. Abū Rajā' al-'Aṭāradī states that Abū Mūsā al-Ash'arī separated his students into groups within the Baṣra Masjid,[29] supervising nearly three hundred.[30]

In the capital, 'Umar selected Yazīd bin 'Abdullāh bin Qusaiṭ to teach the Qur'ān to the outlying Bedouins,[31] and designated Abū Sufyān as an inspector, to proceed to their tribes and discover the extent to which they had learned.[32] He also appointed three Companions in Madinah to teach the children, each with a monthly salary of fifteen dirhams,[33] and advised that everyone (including adults) be taught in easy sets of five verses.[34]

Stabbed by Abū Lū'lū'a (a Christian slave from Persia)[35] towards the end of 23 A.H., 'Umar refused to nominate a caliph, leaving the decision to the people and in the meantime entrusting the *Ṣuḥuf* to his daughter Ḥafṣa, the Prophet's widow.

3. Conclusion

In serving the Qur'ān Abū Bakr acquitted himself most admirably, heeding its mandate of two witnesses for establishing authenticity,[36] and applying this rule to the Qur'ān's own compilation. The result, though written on rudimentary parchments of varying size, constituted as sincere an effort as possible to preserve the Words of Allāh. Decisive victories beyond Arabia's desert boundaries pushed the frontiers of Islamic education to Palestine and Syria; 'Umar's reign witnessed the blossoming of schools for the memorization of the Qur'ān in both the parched sands of Arabia and the rich soils of the fertile crescent. But a new concern clouded the horizon during the 'Uthmāni Caliphate, and Zaid bin Thābit's endeavors, as it turned out, were not to end with the passing of Abū Bakr.

---

[27] Adh-Dhahabī, *Seyar al-A'lām an-Nubalā'*, ii:344-46.

[28] *ibid,* ii:346.

[29] Al-Balādhurī, *Ansāb al-Ashrāf,* i:110; Ibn Ḍurais, *Faḍā'il,* p. 36; al-Ḥākim, *al-Mutadrak*, ii:220.

[30] Al-Faryābī, *Faḍā'il al-Qur'ān,* p. 129.

[31] Ibn al-Kalbī, *Jamhrat an-Nasab*, p. 143; Ibn Ḥazm, *Jamhrat al-Ansāb*, p. 182.

[32] Ibn Ḥajar, *al-Iṣāba*, i:83, no. 332.

[33] Al-Baihaqī, *Sunan al-Kubrā*, vi:124.

[34] Ibn Kathīr, *Faḍā'il*, vii:495.

[35] William Muir, *Annals of the Early Caliphate*, p. 278.

[36] Qur'ān 2:282.

Chapter Seven

ʿUTHMĀN'S MUṢḤAF

During the reign of ʿUthmān, selected by popular pledge (بيعة) as the third caliph, Muslims engaged in *jihād* to the expanses of Azerbaijan and Armenia in the north. Hailing from various tribes and provinces, these fighting forces possessed sundry dialects and the Prophet, out of necessity, had taught them to recite the Qurʾān in their own dialects, given the difficulty of having them abandon their native tongues so suddenly. But the resultant differences in pronunciation now began producing breaches and conflict within the community.

1. Disputes in Recitation and ʿUthmān's Response

Ḥudhaifa bin al-Yamān went to ʿUthmān directly from the Azerbaijani and Armenian frontier where, having united forces from Iraq with others from Syria, he had observed regional differences over the pronunciation of the Qurʾān – differences which had caused friction. "O caliph", he advised, "take this *umma* [community] in hand before they differ about their Book like the Christians and Jews".[1]

Such disagreements were not altogether new, for ʿUmar had anticipated this danger during his caliphate. Having sent Ibn Masʿūd to Iraq, and discovered him teaching in the dialect of Hudhail[2] (as Ibn Masʿūd had originally learned it), ʿUmar rebuked him:

> «وقد أخرج أبو داود من طريق كعب الأنصاري، أنّ عمر كتب إلى ابن مسعود: إنّ القرآن
> نزل بلسان قريش، فأقرئ الناس بلغة قريش، لا بلغة هذيل»[3]
>
> The Qurʾān was revealed in the dialect of Quraish (قريش), so teach according to the dialect of Quraish and not that of Hudhail.

Ibn Ḥajar's comments are valuable in this regard. "For a non-Arab Muslim who desires to read the Qurʾān", he says, "the most propitious choice is to read according to the Quraishi (قرشي) dialect. That is indeed best for him [as all Arabic dialects for him will be of equal difficulty]".[4]

---

[1] Al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, ḥadīth no. 4987; Abū ʿUbaid, *Faḍāʾil*, p. 282. There are many other reports concerning this problem.

[2] One of the major tribes in the Arabian Peninsula at the time.

[3] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:9, quoting Abū Dāwūd.

Ḥudhaifa bin al-Yamān's warning to the caliph came in 25 A.H., and that very year 'Uthmān resolved to end these disputes. Assembling the people, he explained the problem and sought their opinion on recital in different dialects, keeping in mind that some might claim superiority for a particular dialect based on their tribal affiliations.[5] When asked for his own opinion he replied (as narrated by 'Alī bin Abī Ṭālib),

> «نَرى أن نجمع الناس على مصحف واحد فلا تكون فرقة ولا يكون اختلاف. قلنا: فنِعم ما رأيت.»[6]
>
> "I see that we bring the people on a single Muṣḥaf [with a single dialect] so that there is neither division nor discord." We said, "Well have you proposed".

There are two narrations on how 'Uthmān proceeded with this task. In the first (which is the more famous) he made copies relying exclusively on the *Ṣuḥuf* kept in Ḥafṣa's custody, who was the Prophet's widow. A lesser-known narration suggests that he first authorized the compilation of an independent Muṣḥaf, using primary sources, before comparing this with the *Ṣuḥuf*. Both versions concur that the *Ṣuḥuf* of Ḥafṣa played a critical role in the development of 'Uthmān's Muṣḥaf.

2. 'Uthmān Prepares a Muṣḥaf Directly from the Ṣuḥuf

According to the first report 'Uthmān concluded his deliberations, retrieved the *Ṣuḥuf* from Ḥafṣa, and arranged immediately for the scribing of duplicate copies. Al-Barā' narrates,

> So 'Uthmān sent Ḥafṣa a message stating, "Send us the *Ṣuḥuf* so that we may make perfect copies and then return the *Ṣuḥuf* back to you". Ḥafṣa sent it to 'Uthmān, who ordered Zaid bin Thābit, 'Abdullāh bin az-Zubair, Sa'īd bin al-'Āṣ and 'Abdur-Raḥmān bin al-Ḥārith bin Hishām to make duplicate copies. He told the three Quraishī men, "Should you disagree with Zaid bin Thābit on any point regarding the Qur'ān, write it in the dialect of Quraish as the Qur'ān was revealed in their tongue". They did so, and when they had prepared several copies 'Uthmān returned the *Ṣuḥuf* to Ḥafṣa ...[7]

3. 'Uthmān Makes an Independent Copy of the Muṣḥaf

i. Appointing a Committee of Twelve to Oversee the Task

The second account is somewhat more complex. Ibn Sīrīn (*d.* 110 A.H.) reports,

> عن محمد بن سيرين: «أنّ عثمان جمع اثني عشر رجلا من قريش والأنصار، فيهم: أبي بن كعب، وزيد بن ثابت، في جمع القرآن»[8]
>
> 'Uthmān assembled a committee of twelve from both the Quraish and the Anṣār, among them Ubayy bin Ka'b and Zaid bin Thābit, to *collect* (جمع) the Qur'ān.

The identities of the twelve can be pieced together from various sources. Al-Mu'arrij as-Sadūsī states, "The newly-prepared Muṣḥaf was shown to (1) Sa'īd b. al-'Āṣ b. Sa'īd b. al-'Āṣ for proofreading";[9] he further adds (2) Nāfi' b. Zuraib b. 'Amr b. Naufal.[10] Others include (3) Zaid b. Thābit, (4) Ubayy b. Ka'b, (5) 'Abdullāh b. az-Zubair, (6) 'Abdur-Raḥmān b. Hishām, and (7) Kathīr b. Aflaḥ.[11] Ibn Ḥajar lists a few more: (8) Anas b. Mālik, (9) 'Abdullāh b. 'Abbās, and (10) Mālik b. Abī 'Āmir.[12] And al-Bāqillānī completes the set: (11) 'Abdullāh b. 'Umar, and (12) 'Abdullāh b. 'Amr b. al-'Āṣ.[13]

ii. Arranging for an Autonomous Copy

'Uthmān commissioned these twelve to manage this task by collecting and tabulating all the Qur'ānic parchments written in the Prophet's presence.[14] The great historian Ibn 'Asākir (*d.* 571 A.H.) reports in his *History of Damascus*:

---

[4] *ibid*, ix:27.

[5] See Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *al-Maṣāḥif*, p. 22. Different dates have been given for this incident, ranging from 25-30 A.H. I have adopted Ibn Ḥajar's stance. See as-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān*, i:170.

[6] Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *al-Maṣāḥif*, p. 22. See also Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, x:402.

[7] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:11, ḥadīth no. 4987; Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *al-Maṣāḥif*, pp. 19-20; Abū 'Ubaid, *Faḍā'il*, p. 282.

[8] Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, iii/2:62. Note that Ibn Sīrīn used the word جمع (to collect).

[9] Al-Mu'arrij as-Sadūsī, *Kitāb Ḥadhfin min Nasab Quraish*, p. 35.

[10] *ibid*, p. 42.

[11] Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *al-Maṣāḥif*, pp. 20, 25-26.

[12] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:19.

[13] Al-Bāqillānī, *al-Intiṣār (abridged)*, p. 358.

[14] A detailed study of one of the personal Muṣḥafs (see pp. 170 - 72.) reveals that these twelve were subdivided into more than one group, each engaged in dictation and working independently.

Gathering these narratives together gives us the following: 'Uthmān prepared an independent copy relying entirely on primary sources, which included the Companions' parchments along with additional material held by 'Ā'isha.[27]

iv. *'Uthmān Retrieves the Ṣuḥuf from Ḥafṣa for Verification*

Ibn Shabba reports,

> قال ابن شبة: «حدثنا حفص بن عمر الدوري، قال: حدثنا إسماعيل بن جعفر أبو إبراهيم، عن عمارة بن غزية، عن ابن شهاب، عن خارجة بن زيد، عن زيد بن ثابت ﷺ، قال: عرضت المصحف فلم أجد فيه هذه الآية:
>
> ﴿ مِّنَ ٱلْمُؤْمِنِينَ رِجَالٌ صَدَقُوا۟ مَا عَـٰهَدُوا۟ ٱللَّهَ عَلَيْهِ ۖ فَمِنْهُم مَّن قَضَىٰ نَحْبَهُۥ وَمِنْهُم
> مَّن يَنتَظِرُ ۖ وَمَا بَدَّلُوا۟ تَبْدِيلًا ﴿٢٣﴾ ﴾.
>
> قال: فأستعرضت المهاجرين أسألهم عنها، فلم أجدها مع أحد منهم حتى وجدتها مع خزيمة بن ثابت الأنصاري فكتبتها ... ثم عرضته عرضة أخرى فلم أجد فيه شيئا. فأرسل عثمان ﷺ إلى حفصة رضي الله عنها يسألها أن تعطيه الصحيفة، وجعل لها عهد الله ليردها إليها، فأعطته إياه، فعرضت الصحف عليها، فلم تخالفها في شيء فرددتها إليه، وطابت نفسه، فأمر الناس أن يكتبوا المصاحف»[28]
>
> Zaid bin Thābit says, "While revising ['Uthmān's] Muṣḥaf I discovered that it lacked the āyah ﴿من المؤمنين رجال ...﴾, so I searched among the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār [for someone who had written it in the Prophet's presence], till I found it with Khuzaima bin Thābit al-Anṣārī. So I wrote it down ... Then I revised once more, and did not find anything [missing]. 'Uthmān then sent to Ḥafṣa and asked to borrow the *Ṣuḥuf* which had been entrusted to her; she gave it to him only after he vowed to return it. In comparing these two I found no discrepancies. So I gave it back to 'Uthmān and he, with an elated spirit, ordered the people to make duplicate copies of the Muṣḥaf".

So this time the independent copy was rechecked against the official *Ṣuḥuf* which resided with Ḥafṣa.

One may wonder why Caliph 'Uthmān took the trouble to compile an autonomous copy when the end product was to be compared with the *Ṣuḥuf* anyway. The likeliest reason is a symbolic one. A decade earlier thousands of Companions, engaged in the battles against apostasy in Yamāmah and elsewhere, were unable to participate in the *Ṣuḥuf's* compilation. In drawing from a larger pool of written materials, 'Uthmān's independent copy provided these surviving Companions with an opportunity to partake of this momentous endeavor.

In the above account no inconsistencies were found between the *Ṣuḥuf* and the independent Muṣḥaf, and from this two broad conclusions emerge: first, the Qur'ānic text was thoroughly stable from the earliest days and not (as some allege) fluid and volatile until the third century; and second, the methods involved in compilation during both reigns were meticulous and accurate.

---

[27] This can also be inferred from the following *ḥadīths* in *Ṣaḥīḥ* of al-Bukhārī:

- قال زيد بن ثابت: «فتتبعت القرآن، أجمعه من العسب واللخاف وصدور الرجال، حتى وجدت آخر سورة التوبة مع أبي خزيمة الأنصاري لم أجدها مع أحد غيره، (لقد جاءكم رسول من أنفسكم ...) حتى خاتمة براءة، فكانت الصحف عند أبي بكر حتى توفاه الله، ثم عند عمر حياتَه، ثم عند حفصة بنت عمر ﷺ»

  Zaid bin Thābit reports that while compiling the Qur'ān during the reign of Abū Bakr, he could not locate two āyāhs from the end of *Sūra Barā'a* till he found them with Abū Khuzaima al-Anṣārī, with no one else possessing a first-hand copy. The completed *Ṣuḥuf* were kept in Abū Bakr's custody till he passed away ... [al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, ḥadīth no. 4986].

- ... خارجة بن زيد بن ثابت سمع زيد بن ثابت، قال: فقدت آية من الأحزاب حين نسخنا المصحف، قد كنت أسمع رسول الله ﷺ يقرأ بها فالتمسناها فوجدناها مع خزيمة بن ثابت الأنصاري، (من المؤمنين رجال صدقوا ما عاهدوا الله عليه) فالحقناها في سورتها في المصحف.

  Khārija bin Zaid bin Thābit transmitted from his father, Zaid bin Thābit, "While we were copying the Muṣḥaf I missed an āyāh [No. 23 from *Sūra al-Aḥzāb*] which I used to hear the Prophet reciting. We sought it until it was found with Khuzaima bin Thābit al-Anṣārī, and then inserted it into the proper sūra within the Muṣḥaf". [al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, ḥadīth no. 4988].

These two *ḥadīths* have caused confusion among some scholars, mainly due to the proximity of the two names. Note that the two are distinct: Khuzaima and Abū Khuzaima. Now if we read the *ḥadīths* carefully we see that Zaid used the word *Ṣuḥuf* for the collection during Abū Bakr's reign, and the word Muṣḥaf or Maṣāḥif (pl. of Muṣḥaf) for the work he did under 'Uthmān's supervision. Thus we may safely conclude that these are two different instances of compilation. (In the Ṣaḥīḥ, *ḥadith* no. 4986 falls into the section concerning the Qur'ān's collection during Abū Bakr's time, and no. 4988 during 'Uthmān's.) If we consider the second compilation to be Zaid's work on an *independent* copy of the Muṣḥaf, then everything becomes clear. On the other hand, if we assume that Zaid was simply making a duplicate copy for 'Uthmān based on Abū Bakr's *Ṣuḥuf*, not an autonomous copy, then we must confront the awkward question of why Zaid was unable to locate verse No. 23 from *Sūra al-Aḥzāb*—since all the verses should have been right in front of him. Of interest also is that Zaid uses the first person singular pronoun in the first narration and the plural 'we', indicating group activity, in the second. All of this strongly bolsters the view that the second compilation was indeed an independent endeavor.

[28] Ibn Shabba, *Tārīkh al-Madīna*, pp. 1001-2.

4. The Sanctioning and Distribution of ʿUthmān's Muṣḥaf

i. *The Final Copy Read to the Companions*

This definitive copy, once verified against the *Ṣuḥuf*, was

«ثم قُرئت على الصحابة بين يدي عثمان»

"read to the Companions in ʿUthmān's presence".[29] With the final recitation over, he dispatched duplicate copies for distribution throughout the many provinces of the Islamic state. His general injunction that people "write down the Muṣḥafs" indicates his encouragement to the Companions to make duplicate copies for their own personal use.

ii. *The Number of Certified Copies Made*

How many copies did ʿUthmān distribute? According to some reports, four: Kūfa, Baṣra, and Syria, with the last one being kept in Madinah; another account adds Makkah, Yemen and Baḥrain. Ad-Dānī favors the first report.[30] Prof. S. Ḍaif believes however that eight were made because ʿUthmān retained one for himself.[31] In support of this, we know that Khālid bin Iyās made a comparison between the Muṣḥaf kept by ʿUthmān and the one prepared for Madinah.[32] Al-Yaʿqūbī, a Shiite historian, says that ʿUthmān sent Muṣḥafs to Kūfa, Baṣra, Madinah, Makkah, Egypt, Syria, Baḥrain, Yemen and al-Jazīrah, for a total of nine.[33] Of all these localities however there are five whose names are consistently cited by scholars: Madinah, Makkah, Kūfa, Baṣra and Syria, and for each of these we know the identity of the reciter to whom it was entrusted.[34] The inclusion of a sixth is likely as ʿUthmān was reading his own personal copy when he was assassinated,[35] and so this number seems the most logical. There is also evidence that during the process of preparing these copies, some people scribed additional ones for their own personal use. A study of one of these unofficial copies is given in pp. 170 - 72.

---

[29] Ibn Kathīr, *Faḍā'il*, vii:450.

[30] Ad-Dānī, *al-Muqniʿ*, p. 19; see also Ibn Kathīr (who favors seven), *Faḍā'il*, vii:445.

[31] Shauqī Ḍaif, *Kitāb as-Sabʿa of Ibn Mujāhid*, introduction, p. 7.

[32] See pp. 167 - 70.

[33] Al-Yaʿqūbī, *Tārīkh*, ii:170.

[34] A. Al-Imam, *Variant Readings of the Qur'an: A Critical Study of their Historical and Linguistic Origins*, The International Institute of Islamic Thought (IIIT), London & Washington, 2006, p 20.

[35] *At-Tamhīd wa al-Bayān*, pp. 138-39.

iii. *ʿUthmān Burns All Other Manuscripts*

With the task complete, the ink on the final copy dry, and duplicate copies dispatched, there was no need for the numerous fragments of the Qur'ān circulating in people's hands. So all such fragments were burned. Muṣʿab bin Saʿd asserts that the people were pleased with ʿUthmān's decision; at the very least no one voiced any objections.[36] Other reports confirm this unanimous approval, including ʿAlī bin Abī Ṭālib who says,

> قال علي بن أبي طالب: «فوالله ما فعل الذي فعل في المصاحف إلا عن ملإ مِنا جميعا»[37]
>
> By Allāh, he only did what he did with these fragments in clear view of us all [*i.e.* and with our consent].

iv. *ʿUthmān Sends Reciters Along with Muṣḥafs*

No copy was sent forth without a *qāri'* (قارئ: reciter). These included Zaid b. Thābit to Madinah, ʿAbdullāh b. aṣ-Ṣā'ib to Makkah, al-Mughīra b. Shihāb to Syria, ʿĀmir b. ʿAbd Qays to Baṣra and Abū ʿAbdur-Raḥmān as-Sulamī to Kūfa. ʿAbdul-Fattāḥ al-Qāḍī says:

> قال عبد الفتاح القاضي: فكان كل واحد من هؤلاء العلماء يُقرئ أهل مصره بما تعلمه من القراءات الثابتة عن رسول الله ﷺ بطريق التواتر التي يحتملها رسم المصحف دون الثابتة بطريق الآحاد والمنسوخة، وإن كان يحتملها رسم المصحف، المقصود من إرسال القارئ مع المصحف تقييد ما يحتمله الرسم من القراءات بالمنقول منه تواتراً ... فإيفاد عالم مع المصحف دليل واضح على أن القراءة إنما تعتمد على التلقي والنقل والرواية، لا على مجرد الخط والرسم والكتابة.[38]
>
> Each of these scholars recited to the people of his respective city in the manner he had learned through authenticated, multiple channels going back to the Prophet, insofar as these channels lay in complete agreement with each other and fit the Muṣḥaf's consonantal skeleton. Any mode of recitation arriving through a single channel (or containing verses that had been abrogated during the Prophet's lifetime) was discarded. Dispatching reciters with the Muṣḥafs meant limiting the possibilities that were compatible with the consonantal script to only those that enjoyed authenticated and multiple backing.... Sending a scholar with every Muṣḥaf was, therefore, elucidating that proper recitation was dependent on learning through direct contact with teachers whose transmission channels reached to the Prophet, not simply a product of script or spelling conventions.[39]

---

[36] Abū ʿUbaid, *Faḍā'il*, p. 284; ad-Dānī, *al-Muqniʿ*, p. 18.

[37] Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *al-Maṣāḥif*, p. 22; see also pp. 12, 23.

[38] ʿAbdul-Fattāḥ al-Qāḍī, "al-Qirā'āt fī Naẓar al-Mustashriqīn wa al-Mulḥidīn", *Majallat al-Azhar*, vol. 43/2, 1391 (1971), p. 175.

[39] The English rendering is not verbatim but is only meant to convey the narration's gist.

Early copies of ʿUthmān's Muṣḥaf were largely consonantal, frequently dropping vowels and containing no dots,[40] much like the image below which is taken from a Muṣḥaf in the Ḥejāzī script.[41]

Figure 7.1: Example of a very early Muṣḥaf in the Ḥejāzī script. Note the lack of skeletal dots. Courtesy of the National Archive Museum of Yemen.

These copies could be read erroneously in many ways.[42] In undertaking this second compilation, ʿUthmān's main purpose was to eliminate all occasion for disputes in recitation; sending a Muṣḥaf by itself, or with a reciter at liberty to devise any reading, was contrary to the unity ʿUthmān sought to establish within the populace. The existence of total unity in the Qur'ānic texts throughout the world for fourteen centuries, between all countries and all divergent Muslim sects, is proof enough of ʿUthmān's unparalleled success in gathering all Muslims upon a single text.

v. *ʿUthmān's Instructions with the Muṣḥafs He Sent*

1. ʿUthmān decreed that all personal Muṣḥafs differing from his own should be burned, as failure to eliminate these would engender further strife. Anas bin Mālik reports,

---

[40] For a detailed discussion on dots, see pp. 151 - 58.

[41] Some of the first official ʿUthmānī Muṣḥafs were most likely written in the Ḥejāzī script. There are a handful of Muṣḥafs attributed to ʿUthmān worldwide [see pp. 347 - 50.]. While the manuscripts themselves are mute on this point, such attributions may imply that they were actually copied from one of the Muṣḥafs dispatched by ʿUthmān, either directly or via other intermediary copies.

[42] A common Orientalist allegation is that the ʿUthmāni Muṣḥaf, devoid as it was of dots, caused divergences in the readings of the Qur'ān. See Chapter 12 for a thorough analysis of this subject.

قال الزهري: أخبرني أنس بن مالك ... «وأرسل إلى كلّ جند من أجناد المسلمين بمصحف
وأمرهم أن يحرقوا كلّ مصحف يخالف المصحف الذي أرسل به»[43]

> Dispatching to each Muslim province its own Muṣḥaf, he instructed them to burn all other copies which differed from his.

Anas' statement represents only one possible scenario out of many. According to other narratives, ʿUthmān ordained that all earlier copies were to be torn or burned.[44] In another account, by erasing away the ink. Abū Qilāba states, "ʿUthmān wrote to every center, 'I... have erased what was in my possession, now erase what is in yours'."[45] Once, a delegation traveled from Iraq to Madinah and visited Ubayy's son, informing him that they had journeyed with great hardship solely to see Ubayy's Muṣḥaf. He replied that ʿUthmān had taken it away. Perhaps thinking that he was simply reluctant, they repeated their request and he repeated his answer.[46]

Ibn Ḥajar says that despite most reports incorporating the word *at-taḥrīq* (التحريق: burning), every possibility must be considered. The fate of each fragment rested with the individual possessing it: whether to erase, tear, or burn.[47] I believe one more possibility exists. Some people may have chosen to compare their personal Muṣḥafs with ʿUthmān's and, where differences appeared, to amend them. ʿAbdul-Aʿlā bin Ḥakam al-Kilābī's statement bears this out:

> Entering the house of Abū Mūsā al-Ashʿarī, I discovered him in the company of Ḥudhaifa bin al-Yamān and ʿAbdullāh bin Masʿūd on the top floor.... They were gathered around a Muṣḥaf sent by ʿUthmān, accompanied by an order to correct their own copies in accordance with his. Abū Mūsā told them, 'Whatever you find in my Muṣḥaf that is additional [to ʿUthmān's], do not remove it, and whatever you find missing, write it down'.[48]

2. ʿUthmān's second injunction was not to recite against the script of the Muṣḥaf. The unanimous agreement to dispose of (or amend) all earlier copies made ʿUthmān's script and spelling the new standard; from then on every Muslim learning the Qur'ān had to conform with the ʿUthmāni text. Where a person's previous schooling was at

---

[43] Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *al-Maṣāḥif*, pp. 19-20; see also al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, Bāb Jamʿi al-Qur'ān, ḥadīth no. 4987; Ibn Kathīr, *Faḍā'il*, vii:442.

[44] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:20.

[45] *ibid*, ix:21.

[46] Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *al-Maṣāḥif*, p. 25.

[47] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:21.

[48] Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *al-Maṣāḥif*, p. 35.

> odds with this text, he was not granted leave to recite or teach in that divergent manner.[49] So what could such a person do? Attending an official reciter's circle was the simplest solution, to learn the Book in accordance with the conditions laid and thereby regain the privileges of teaching and recitation. 'Uthmān's unparalleled success in this regard is proof positive that his actions echoed the voice of the community.

With the work concluded and dispatched many Muslim scholars, including some very notable Companions, embarked on a word-by-word scrutiny of these Muṣḥafs. In Chapter 11 we will cover their findings in depth. There is also convincing evidence that the process of preparing official copies was a team effort where some dictated and others scribed, and fortunate indeed are we to have details regarding one such Muṣḥaf penned by a member of 'Uthmān's committee of twelve.[50] This too is discussed in Chapter 11. In fact it appears that 'Uthmān personally encouraged all individuals to pen their own private copies. A statement by Ibn Shabba supports this,

«فأمر الناس أن يكتبوا المصاحف»[51]

> ['Uthmān] ordered the people to make duplicate copies of the Muṣḥaf.

5. Al-Ḥajjāj and His Contributions to the Muṣḥaf

From Caliph 'Uthmān we now turn our gaze to al-Ḥajjāj bin Yūsuf ath-Thaqafī (*d.* 95 A.H.), governor of Iraq during the Umayyad Caliphate and a man of considerable notoriety. His unflinching, iron-fisted rule won him many unflattering remarks in the annals of Iraq's history. Ironically he also played a role in serving the Qur'ān, though even in this regard he had no shortage of enemies. Ibn Abī Dāwūd quotes 'Auf bin Abī Jamīla (60-146 A.H.), by way of 'Abbād bin Ṣuhayb (*d.* 212 A.H.), alleging that al-Ḥajjāj altered the 'Uthmāni Muṣḥaf in eleven places.[52] Closer inspection reveals serious problems with this report. Firstly the narrative chain is grossly defective as 'Abbād is a narrator of very low repute whose statements are rejected.[53] 'Auf bin Abī Jamīla on the other hand, while classed as trustworthy,

---

[49] This concept will be clarified in a subsequent discussion (Chapter 13).

[50] The Muṣḥaf of Mālik b. Abī 'Āmir al-Aṣbaḥī (*d.* 74 A.H./693 C.E.), see pp. 170 - 72.

[51] Ibn Shabba, *Tārīkh al-Madīna*, p. 1002.

[52] Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *al-Maṣāḥif*, pp. 117-18.

[53] Among Ḥadīth scholars (Muḥaddithīn) some classified narrators into twelve caegories (for details see Chapter 13). 'Abbād is classified as *matrūk al-ḥadīth* (متروك الحديث) which is the third lowest grade. Those who classified 'Abbād as such

had Shiite tendencies as well as being anti-Umayyad.[54] Mu'āwiya, the first Umayyad ruler, fought 'Alī on the pretext of 'Uthmān's blood. Al-Ḥajjāj, being one of the strongest towers in the Umayyad garrison, would have been a natural target for 'Auf. Any report issuing from the opposite camp must be approached with extreme caution. Secondly the scholarship of Ibn Abī Dāwūd was discredited during his own lifetime, even by his own father.[55] Thirdly the Abbasids, successors to and bitter rivals of the Umayyad dynasty, were certain to exploit any such incident for political leverage had there been a hint of truth to this story. That we do not find this to be the case is most telling.

Whatever the truth, the following is the list of words al-Ḥajjāj is accused of altering:[56]

	Sūra:verse	'Uthmān's Muṣḥaf	Al-Ḥajjāj's alleged alteration
1	2:259	لم يتسن وانظر	لم يتسنه وانظر
2	5:48	شريعة ومنهاجا	شرعة ومنهاجا
3	10:22	هو الذي ينشركم	هو الذي يسيركم
4	12:45	أنا آتيكم بتأويله	أنا انبئكم بتأويله
5	23:87 and 89	سيقولون لله	سيقولون الله
6	26:116	من المخرجين	من المرجومين
7	26:167	من المرجومين	من المخرجين
8	43:32	نحن قسمنا بينهم معئشهم	نحن قسمنا بينهم معيشتهم
9	47:15	من ماء غير يسن	من ماء غير آسن
10	57:7	منكم واتقوا	منكم وانفقوا
11	81:24	بظنين	بضنين

---

include al-Bukhārī [*Kitāb aḍ-Ḍu'afā' aṣ-Ṣagīr*, Dar al-Wa'ī, Haleb, 1396/1976, entry no. 228] and an-Nasā'ī [*Kitāb aḍ-Ḍu'fā' wa al-Matrūkīn*, Dar al-Wa'ī, Haleb, 1396/1976, entry no. 411]. Quoting Abū Ḥātim, "['Abbād's] ḥadīth is weak, his ḥadīth is disavowed, his ḥadīth is forsaken". Ibn 'Adī criticized Ibn Abī Dāwūd (the author of *Kitāb al-Maṣāḥif*) for quoting a ḥadīth narrated by 'Abbād while knowing that he is of low repute [M. Wā'iẓ (ed.), *Kitāb al-Maṣāḥif of Ibn Abī Dāwūd*, Dar al-Bashā'ir al-Islāmiyyah, Beirut, 2nd edition, 2002, vol. 2, p. 734].

[54] Ibn Ḥajar, *Taqrīb at-Tahzīb*, p. 433, entry no. 5215. Al-Ḥajjāj's supposed changes seem particularly implausible as that would harm the Umayyad cause.

[55] His father was the famous ḥadīth scholar Abū Dāwūd Sulaimān b. al-Ash'ath as-Sajistānī. Numerous scholars discredited Ibn Abī Dāwūd [adh-Dhahabī, *Tadhkirat al-Ḥuffāẓ*, ii:770-72; also as-Suyūṭī, *Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥuffāẓ*, pp. 75-76].

[56] Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *al-Maṣāḥif*, pp. 117-18.

part. His next aim was to uncover the location of each third and fourth of the Qur'ān.[67] Al-Ḥimmānī mentions that al-Ḥajjāj would follow-up the progress of the committee every night; the entire undertaking required four months.[68]

Al-Munaggid writes that he came across a Muṣḥaf in Topkapi Sarayi (Istanbul), No. 44, where the notes indicate that it was penned by Ḥudaij b. Muʿāwiya b. Maslama al-Anṣārī for ʿUqba b. Nāfiʿ al-Fihrī in the year 49 A.H. He casts doubt on the date, partly because of folio 3b which contains a statistical count of every letter of the alphabet within the entire Qur'ān. Statistical analysis was too advanced a concern for Muslims of the first century A.H., he argues.[69] Given al-Ḥajjāj's initiative in this regard, al-Munaggid's doubts seem ill-founded.

Our computer contains a plain-text copy of the Qur'ān without diacritical marks; with the aid of a small program we counted 332,795 characters. Al-Ḥajjāj's methodology is unknown to us: was *shadda* considered a character? What about an *alif* that is read but not written (*e.g.* ملك)? Despite lacking these particulars, the proximity of our computer figure with that obtained by al-Ḥajjāj's committee well over thirteen centuries ago, indicates that those four intensive months of counting really did take place.

6. Muṣḥafs in the Marketplace

In the early days, according to Ibn Masʿūd, a person desiring a copy of the Muṣḥaf would simply approach this or that volunteer and request his assistance;[70] this is seconded by Alī bin Ḥusain (*d.* 93 A.H.) who recounts that Muṣḥafs were not bought or sold, and that a man would fetch his own parchments to the pulpit and ask for volunteering scribes. A string of volunteers would then be engaged, one after another, till the task was complete.[71] When Muḥil once quarreled with Ibrāhīm an-Nakhaʿī that people needed Muṣḥafs to recite, Ibrāhīm replied, "Buy the parchment and ink and have the help of volunteers".[72] But with the Muslim population swelling beyond the frontiers of the Arabian Peninsula, the rise in demand for copies of the Qur'ān placed tremendous strain on volunteer scribes and triggered a new phenomenon: the paid copyist.

---

[67] Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *al-Maṣāḥif*, pp. 119-20.

[68] *ibid*, p. 120.

[69] S. al-Munaggid, op. cit., pp. 82-83.

[70] Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *al-Maṣāḥif*, p. 160.

[71] *ibid*, p. 166.

[72] *ibid*, p. 169.

This new profession brought in its wake a theological dilemma, about the legitimacy of paying someone to serve the Word of Allāh. A person may only sell items that belong to him or her, many reasoned, so on what basis could the Qur'ān be sold when it was not the property of an individual, but of the Creator? The majority of scholars disliked the idea of paid copying and of introducing Muṣḥafs as a marketplace commodity, among them Ibn Ma'ūd (*d.* 32 A.H.), ʿAlqama (*d.* after 60 A.H.), Masrūq (*d.* 63 A.H.), Shuraiḥ (*d.* 80 A.H.), Ibrāhīm an-Nakhaʿī (*d.* 96 A.H.), Abū Mijlaz (*d.* 106 A.H.) and others,[73] while Ibn al-Musayyīb (*d.* after 90 A.H.) spoke staunchly against it.[74] There were others, however, who sought to temper their colleagues' criticism by pointing out that the payment was not for the Word of Allāh, but rather for the ink, parchment and labor; taking the acute shortage of volunteers into account, such scholars as Ibn ʿAbbās (*d.* 68 A.H.), Saʿīd b. Jubair (*d.* 95 A.H.) and Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya (*d.* 100 A.H.) did not find the sale or purchase of Muṣḥafs distasteful.[75] The same debate extended to the revision of Muṣḥafs and the amendment of any scribing mistakes therein which, initially the volunteer's task, soon passed into the hands of the paid proofreader. Saʿīd b. Jubair, once offering a Muṣḥaf to Mūsā al-Asadī, asserted that he had gone through, corrected the errors and that it was for sale.[76] Following their earlier argument Ibrāhīm an-Nakhaʿī and others disapproved of paying for revision, though Ibrāhīm in particular altered his stance afterwards.[77]

ʿAmr b. Murra (*d.* 118 A.H.) contends that it was the slaves who first initiated the business of selling Muṣḥafs.[78] Ibn ʿAbbās' slave, for example, charged one hundred dirhams for copying the Qur'ān.[79] The trade in Muṣḥafs appears to have originated during Muʿāwiya's reign, according to Abū Mijlaz, which places this just ahead of the middle of the first century A.H.[80] The growth of commerce soon brought about shops specializing in Muṣḥafs; if they happened to pass by such a shop Ibn ʿUmar (*d.* 73 A.H.) and Sālim b. ʿAbdullāh (*d.* 106 A.H.) would pronounce it "a dreadful trade",[81] while Abū al-ʿĀlīya (*d.* 90 A.H.) wished punishment for those who put the Qur'ān up for sale.[82]

---

[73] Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *al-Maṣāḥif*, pp. 160, 166, 169, 175; see also Ibn Abī Shaiba, *Muṣannaf*, iv:292.

[74] Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *al-Maṣāḥif*, p. 166.

[75] Ibn Abī Shaiba, *Muṣannaf*, iv:293; see also Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *al-Maṣāḥif*, p. 175.

[76] Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *al-Maṣāḥif*, pp. 175-76.

[77] *ibid*, pp. 157, 167, 169.

[78] *ibid*, p. 171.

[79] Al-Bukhārī, *Khalq Afʿāl al-ʿIbād*, p. 32.

[80] Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *al-Maṣāḥif*, p. 175.

[81] *ibid*, pp. 159, 165; see also Ibn Abī Shaiba, *Muṣannaf*, iv:292.

[82] Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *al-Maṣāḥif*, p. 169.

A more altruistic trend was the public library. Mujāhid (20–103 A.H.) reports that Ibn Abī Lailā (*d.* 83 A.H.) founded a library containing only the Holy Qur'ān, where people would gather for recitation.[83] 'Abdul-Ḥakam b. 'Amr al-Jumaḥī established a different sort of library by the middle of the first century A.H., housing *Kurrāsāt* (كراسات: booklets) on assorted subjects in addition to various games, and here people freely used the facilities for reading and amusement.[84] Sources mention another library belonging to Khālid b. Yazīd b. Mu'āwiya;[85] there may have been others whose details are now lost to us.[86]

7. Conclusion

The efficacy of 'Uthmān's endeavors is clear in at least two ways. First, no Muslim province remained but that it absorbed this Muṣḥaf into its bloodstream; and second, that a span of fourteen centuries has not been able to corrupt or dent the skeletal text of his Muṣḥaf. Truly a manifestation of the Holy Qur'ān's miraculous nature; any other explanation fails. Later caliphs, perhaps seeking a foothold in the chronicles of posterity, commissioned and dispatched further official copies, but nothing was ever sent forth which contradicted 'Uthmān's universal standard.

To this day there exist Muṣḥafs attributed directly to 'Uthmān. Though this appellation suggests that they are 'Uthmān's originals, the most likely scenario is that these were transcribed from the originals or from duplicated copies thereof. These include manuscripts in Topkapi Saray (Istanbul), in Cairo, in the India Office Library (London), and in Tashkent (known also as the Muṣḥaf of Samarqand). They are written on leather, not paper, and appear to be contemporaneous.[87] Their skeletal texts agree with the authenticated qirā'āt and, therefore, with Muṣḥafs from the first and subsequent centuries A.H. up to those used in our present day.[88]

---

[83] Ibn Sa'd, *Ṭabaqāt*, iv:75; see also Ibn Abi Dawud, *al-Masahif*, p. 151.

[84] Al-Aṣfahānī, *al-Aghānī*, iv:253.

[85] Contrary to Krenkow's supposition ["Kitābkhāna", *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, first edition, iv:1045], this library was probably founded after those of Ibn Abī Lailā and 'Abdul-Ḥakam b. 'Amr al-Jumaḥī, and is therefore not the earliest of its kind.

[86] M.M. al-'Aẓamī, *Studies in Early Hadith Literature*, pp. 16-17.

[87] M. Hamidullah, *Khuṭābāt Bhawalpur*, Islamic Research Institute, 1992, p. 26.

[88] Though it remains one of the great written treasures of the world, the Samarqand Muṣḥaf is unfortunately no longer pristine. In 1905 the Russian Orientalist S. Pissareff, opting to publish a facsimile edition, personally re-inked the text in dulled folios and in the process committed unintentional errors [Jeffery and Mendelsohn, "The Orthography of the Samarqand Qur'an Codex", *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 62, 1942, p. 176].

While the skeletal text remained constant, over time surface alterations began to materialize in the Muṣḥafs circulating within the early Muslim community. These bore no effect on the pronunciation of words or the meaning of verses. 'Uthman himself may have been familiar with aspects of this phenomenon; his decision to minimize written vowels, keep away from verse separators, and avoid the use of dots was most likely meant as a deterrent to those who would memorize the Qur'ān by themselves without proper guidance. But with the passing of time (and no long stretch at that) the inclusion of dots and verse separators become the norm, so let us examine the full implications of this over the next few chapters.

Chapter Eight

The Evolution of Reading Aids Within the Muṣḥaf

Here we briefly explore some of the visual aids and aesthetic improvements that scribes incorporated into Muṣḥafs, before embarking on the more complex topics of Arabic paleography and the dotting system in the next chapter.

1. Sūra Separators

While initial copies of ʿUthmān's Muṣḥaf lacked sūra separators (فواصل السور), the beginning of each sūra was readily discernible from the phrase: بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم, usually preceded by a small clearance. This we can see in the example below.

Figure 8.1: A Muṣḥaf from the first century A.H. *in Ḥejāzī script.*
Source: Maṣāḥif Ṣanʿāʾ, plate 4.

The numerous unofficial copies penned concurrently with ʿUthmān's Muṣḥaf provide us with our first glimpse of sūra separators, through the introduction of a simple ornament. Naturally the phrase بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم is still there. Mālik bin Abī ʿĀmir's Muṣḥaf is one such example.[1]

---

[1] For further details, see pp. 170 - 72.

Figure 8.2: A Muṣḥaf in Ḥejāzī script from the first century A.H.
Source: Maṣāḥif Ṣanʿāʾ, plate 11.

This was soon followed by the introduction of the sūra title, possibly in a different color, while still retaining the ornament and بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم.

Figure 8.3: A Muṣḥaf from the late first or early second century A.H.
An ornament followed by the title (in gold ink) separates the sūras.
Courtesy: National Archive Museum of Yemen.

2. Āyah Separators

ʿUthmān's Muṣḥaf was also devoid of āyah separators, as we can see from the two figures below; both are taken from the celebrated Muṣḥaf of

Tashkent (also known as of Samarqand) which is popularly attributed to ʿUthmān.[2]

Figure 8.4: The Muṣḥaf of Tashkent.
Source: al-Munaggid, Etudes, *p. 51.*

Figure 8.5: Another folio from the Muṣḥaf of Tashkent.
Source: Maṣāḥif Ṣanʿāʾ, p. 35.

Before long āyah separators trickled in. No fixed style was observed, each scribe freely devising his own. The three examples I present are all taken from Muṣḥafs in the Ḥejāzī script (first century A.H.). In the first sample the āyahs are separated by two columns of three dots each; in the second, a row of four dots; in the third, a triangular arrangement.

---

[2] For a detailed discussion of this Muṣḥaf and others known as 'Muṣḥaf of ʿUthmān' see pp. 172 - 82.

Figure 8.6: First century A.H. Muṣḥaf with āyah separators in the form of dotted columns. Source: Maṣāḥif Ṣan'ā', plate 3 (page 61).

Figure 8.7: A Muṣḥaf from the first century A.H. with āyah separators in the form of horizontal dots. Source: Maṣāḥif Ṣan'ā', plate 3 (page 60).

Figure 8.8: Another Muṣḥaf from the first century A.H. with āyah separators in a triangular form. Courtesy of the National Archive Museum of Yemen.

Additional refinements were subsequently devised, in the form of special markers for every fifth and/or tenth āyah.

Figure 8.9: A Muṣḥaf from the second century A.H. with a special marker on every tenth āyah (second line from the top). Courtesy of National Archive Museum of Yemen.

Figure 8.10: This Muṣḥaf from the third century A.H. has a marker for every fifth āyah (third line from the top, in the shape of a golden teardrop) and another for every tenth āyah (third line from bottom). All other āyahs are separated by a triangular arrangement. By permission of the British Library, manuscript Or. 1397, f.15b.

Another noteworthy Muṣḥaf, this one penned by the master calligrapher Ibn al-Bawwāb and dated 391 A.H./1000 C.E., is preserved at the Chester Beatty Library in Dublin. It too features special markers for every fifth and tenth āyah. Within the latter are inscribed the words عشر, عشرون, ثلاثون ... *i.e.* ten, twenty, thirty *etc.*

Figure 8.11: The famous Muṣḥaf of Ibn al-Bawwāb, dated 391 A.H. Inside the large golden circular device is written 'Arba'ūn' ('forty').

3. Conclusion

In the previous chapter we noted al-Ḥajjāj's meticulous quest for the whereabouts of every third, fourth, and seventh portion of the Qur'ān. Shortly afterwards, perhaps at the close of the first century A.H., the Muṣḥaf was divided into seven parts known as manāzil (منازل). This was intended to assist those who sought to finish the entire Muṣḥaf in a week's time. The third century A.H. witnessed additional symbols, dividing the Book into thirty parts (جزء: juz') for the reader who desired a full month. These divisions were the practical outgrowth of al-Ḥajjāj's curiosity and have served, ever since, as a useful tool for all who wish to pace themselves.

Intricate borders, the use of gold ink, and many other developments were adopted according to each scribe's tastes and abilities. But these were purely aesthetic, unlike the sūra and āyah separators which were genuine reading aids as well, and so we will not discuss them here. There were other reading aids besides, in the form of dots and diacritical marks, and these had an immensely profound impact on the learning of the Qur'ān for non-native speakers throughout the Muslim realms. These aids, and the Orientalist controversies surrounding them, are the focus of our next chapter.

CHAPTER NINE

THE HISTORY OF ARABIC PALEOGRAPHY

The inquisitive reader might wonder why Arabic paleography and orthography, seemingly unrelated to the topic at hand, have found their way into this book, and the answer will make more sense if I first explain these terms. Paleography generally refers to the study of ancient documents, though here I use it in a more confined sense: the study of a language's script (such as the shape of letters or the use of dots). This differs from orthography, which focuses on spelling conventions. Most of the circulating theories about Arabic paleography, about its origins and development, are biblically rooted; were they of esoteric interest only I would not have given them space in this work. But these theories have a direct bearing on the Qur'ān's integrity, since they allege that Arabic possessed no known alphabet during the Prophet's lifetime (Mingana), that divergences in the readings of certain verses are due to faults in early Arabic paleography (Goldziher), and that any copy of the Qur'ān written in Kūfic script belongs to the second or third century A.H., never to the first (Gruendler). Countering these arguments is a prerequisite to proving that the Holy Book is untainted.

1. The Historical Background of Arabic Characters

The ancestry of Arabic characters remains speculative, and it is hardly surprising that Orientalists have chimed in with their own theories in this regard. Sadly, most of these cannot hold up to even cursive scrutiny. B. Gruendler, author of a study on the Arabic script's development, states that of all the scripts emanating from the Phoenician alphabet, Arabic seems the most remote. The drastic alterations in spatial arrangement suggest that either the Nabataean or Syriac scripts served as an intermediary. T. Nöldeke, in 1865, gave credit to the former for the development of the Arabic Kūfic script; numerous others, among them M.A. Levy, M. de Vogüé, J. Karabacek and J. Euting, jumped on the bandwagon soon thereafter. But half a century later this consensus was shattered when J. Starcky theorized that Arabic derived from the Syriac cursive.[1] On the other hand we have

---

[1] Beatrice Gruendler, *The Development of the Arabic Script*, Scholars Press, Atlanta, Georgia, 1993, p. 1. Starcky's arguments have been refuted in detail [*ibid*, p. 2].

Y. Khalīl an-Nāmī's theory that the "Hijaz was the home of the birth and evolution of the North Arabic script to the exclusion of all other localities, including Hirah".[2] As to why Gruendler completely neglects this third premise, I will leave to the reader.

Among the missionary Orientalists there are those who believe that Arab Muslims did not have their own writing system during the Prophet's lifetime. In the words of Rev. Mingana,

> Our ignorance of the Arabic language in the early period of its evolution is such that we can not even know with certainty whether it had any [alphabet] of its own in Mecca and Madina. If a kind of writing existed in these two localities, it must have been something very similar to Estrangelo [i.e. Syriac] or the Hebrew characters.[3]

Nabia Abbott has partially championed this hypothesis.

> A study of Christian Arabic manuscripts shows the interesting fact that some of the earliest of these come the nearest to showing an estrangelo influence, though indirectly through the Nestorian, in the general appearance of the script, which is firm and inclined to squareness. Others… show the effect of Jacobite serto. Furthermore, a comparison of several of these Christian manuscripts with largely contemporary Kufic Kurans reveals a decided similarity of scripts.[4]

All is not as it seems, however. According to Abbott, "The earliest dated Christian Arabic manuscript [is from] 876",[5] meaning 264 A.H. ʿAwwād has mentioned an even earlier dated manuscript, written in 253 A.H./867 C.E.[6] The earliest dated Christian Arabic manuscripts therefore stem from the second half of the third century A.H. There are literally hundreds if not thousands of Qur'ānic manuscripts belonging to this period; comparing these thousands with one or two estrangelo (Syriac) examples and claiming that the latter influenced the former is very poor science indeed, if it can be called scientific at all. On top of this I will add that the Syriac script *c.* 250 A.H. (angular and forward-slanted) does not correspond at all with the general Arabic of that period, which is inclined to spacious curves and vertical strokes. One wonders why Abbott shied away from using Arabic

documents and Qur'ānic manuscripts from the first century A.H., which rest on library shelves in relative abundance.

Leaving the Syriac aside, the other culture credited with providing the impetus for Arabic paleography is the Nabataean. According to Dr. Jumʿa, extensive research by authoritative scholars has proved that the Arabs derived their writing from them; in this he quotes a multitude of scholars such as Abbott and Wilfinson.[7] Analyzing a set of the earliest Muslim inscriptions, coins and manuscripts, Abbott concludes that the Arabic script in use at the dawn of Islam was a natural development of pre-Islamic Arabic which in turn was a direct development of the Aramaic Nabataean script of the first centuries C.E.[8]

One must not digest these labels in haste however. Instead of acquiescing to Western scholarship without any independent analysis of one's own, as

30
35
40
45
50
35
30
25
20
MEDITERRANEAN SEA
Aleppo
Zabad
Euphrates
Tigris
SYRIA
Palmyra (Tadmur)
R.
Damascus
HAURAN
Namārah
NABATAEANS
Harrān
Buṣrā (Bostra)
Umm al-Jimāl
Anbār
Kūfah
Ḥīrah
IRAK
ARABIA DESERTA
Baṣrah
PERSIAN GULF
NA
Ma'ān
Petra
SINAI
ARABIA PETRAEA
Dūmat al-Jandal
NABATAEANS
Tabūk
Madā'in Ṣāliḥ (Ḥijr)
'Ulā
EGYPT
HIJAZ
RED SEA
Madīnah
Tropic of Cancer
Nile R.
Makkah
Ṭā'if
0 100 200 300 MILES
0 100 200 300 400 KILOMETERS

Figure 9.1: Probable routes of diffusion of the early north Arabic script, according to Abbott. Source: Abbott, The Rise of the North Arabic Script, *p. 3.*

---

[2] Nabia Abbott, *The Rise of the North Arabic Script and its Kur'ānic Development, with a full Description of the Kur'ān Manuscripts in the Oriental Institute*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1938, p. 6, footnote 36.

[3] Mingana, "Transmission of the Kuran", *The Moslem World*, vol. 7 (1917), p. 412.

[4] N. Abbott, op. cit., p. 20.

[5] *ibid*, p. 20, footnote 20.

[6] K. ʿAwwād, *Aqdamul-Makhṭūṭāt al-ʿArabīyya fī Maktabāt al-ʿĀlam*, Baghdad, 1982, p. 65.

[7] Ibrāhīm Jumʿa, *Dirāsātun fī Taṭawwur al-Kitābāt al-Kūfiyya*, 1969, p. 17

[8] N. Abbott, op. cit., p. 16.

unfortunately many Arab writers have done, let us start afresh by inspecting a partial map supplied by Abbott for her relevant inscriptions.

Here are the sites of the five inscriptions in Plate I of Abbott's work, which form the basis for her Nabataean conclusion: (1) Nabataean inscription on tombstone of Fihr, Umm al-Jimāl, c. A.D. 250;[9] (2) Arabic inscription of Imru' al-Kais, Namārah, A.D. 328; (3) Arabic inscription from Zabad, A.D. 512; (4) Arabic inscription at Ḥarrān, A.D. 568; and (5) Arabic inscription at Umm al-Jimāl, sixth century C.E.

Here we have only one so-called Nabataean inscription (from Umm al-Jimāl) while four are in Arabic, including another one at that same site. Of the Arabic inscriptions one lies in Zabad, very close to Aleppo in northern Syria; another is in Namārah, southeast of Damascus; the third and fourth are from north of Ma'ān, once the Nabataean capital. So Arabic stretched itself from northern Syria down into Arabia in an unbroken line, carving straight through the Nabataean homeland rather than being hedged in by it. What does this reveal about the relationship between the two languages? I contend that there never existed a language known to its speakers as 'Nabataean', as shown next.

2. Studies in Early Arabic Documents and Inscriptions

i. *The Blurred Line between Nabataean and Arabic Inscriptions*

Among scholars there is a general disagreement concerning what constitutes a Nabataean or Arabic inscription. Some scholars cited a few of the later inscriptions as Nabataean only to see their colleagues revise them subsequently as Arabic, and the following examples will illustrate this.

1. An Aramaic-Arabic inscription at 'En 'Avdat in Negev, discovered in 1979 about five kilometers south of Oboda. It contains the oldest dateable text in Arabic. Of its six lines Bellamy opines that only lines four and five are in Arabic, transcribed in Nabataean script.[10] Anttila, however, argues that line six is just as likely to be in Arabic as Aramaic.[11] The inscription is dated to be between 88 – 150 C.E.[12]

Figure 9.2: The oldest dateable Arabic inscription at 'En 'Advat in Negev, c. prior to 150 C.E. Lines four through six are in Arabic while the remainder is in Aramaic.

2. A bilingual Nabataean-Greek inscription on the tombstone of Fihr, Umm al-Jimāl, dated to *c.* 250 C.E. Cantineau, Abbott and Gruendler all subscribe to Littmann's view, who treats it as Nabataean.[13]

HCTHΛHAΥΤΗΦΕ
ΡΟΥCΟΛΛΕΟΥ
ΤΡΟΦΕΥCΓΑΔΙ
ΜΑΘΟΥΒΑCΙΛΕΥC
ΘΑ ΝΟΥΗΝWΝ

هذا قبر فهر	دنه نقشو فهرو
ابن شلي مربي جذيمة	بن شلي ربو جديمت
ملك تنوخ	ملك تنوخ

Figure 9.3: A bilingual Nabataean-Greek inscription on the tombstone of Fihr, Umm al-Jimāl, c. 250 C.E. followed by line for line original inscription reading (left) and in classical Arabic (right).[14]

---

[9] Interestingly, on page 4 Abbott calls the same inscription "a Greek-Aramaic inscription at Umm al-Jimāl".

[10] J. Bellamy, "Arabic Verses from the First/Second Century: The Inscription of 'En 'Avdat", *Journal of Semitic Studies*, vol. 35, no. 1, 1990, pp. 73-79. The Arabic portion reads (after Bellamy): "[4] For (Obodas) works without reward or favor, and he, when death tried to claim us, did not [5] let it claim (us), for when a wound (of ours) festered, he did not let us perish." Numbers inside brackets refer to the lines of the inscription.

[11] J. Hämeen-Anttila, "A Note on the 'En 'Avdat Inscription", *Studia Orientala* (Helsinki), vol. 67, 1991, pp. 35-36. It is worth noting that line 2 is only partly legible, so it may fall either way.

[12] A. Negev dates it between 88 and 125 C.E. but not later than 150 C.E., since afterwards Nabataean-Aramaic inscriptions were no longer written at Oboda ('Avdat) [A. Negev, J. Naveh and S. Shaked, "Obodas the God", *Israel Exploration Journal*, vol. 36, no. 1-2, 1986, p. 60].

[13] J. Cantineau, *Le Nabatéen*, Otto Zeller, Osnabrück, 1978 , ii:25 (reprint of 1930 edition); N. Abbott, *The Rise of the North Arabic Script*, Plate (I – 1); see also B. Gruendler, *The Development of the Arabic Script*, p. 10.

[14] Source of the image, J. Cantineau, op. cit., ii:25. The inscription reading from, S. al-Munaggid, *Etudes De Paleographie Arabe*, Dār al-Kitāb al-Jadīd, Beirut, 1972, p. 20, figure 8.

3. The Raqūsh tombstone in Madā'in Ṣāleḥ, dated to the year 162 after Bosra (corresponding to 267 C.E.). Both Cantineau and Gruendler catalogue it as a 'Nabataean text',[15] though the latter mentions, "The text is noteworthy for its many Arabisms. O'Conner describes it as an eccentric mixture of Nabatean and Arabic ... Blau labels it a border dialect and Diem assigns it to a Nabatean-Ḥijāzī sub-group".[16] In their 1989 paper, Healey and Smith hailed it as the earliest dated Arabic document.[17]

دنه قبرو صنعه كعبو بر
حرثت لرقوش برت
عبدمنوتو امه وهي
هلكت في الحجرو
سنت ماه وستين
وترين بيرخ تموز ولعن
مري علما من يشنا القبرو
ذا ومن يفتحه حشي [و]
ولده ولعن من يقبر و[يعـ]ـلي منه

Figure 9.4: The recently re-interpreted Raqūsh tombstone, the second oldest dated Arabic inscription, corresponding to c. 267 C.E., along with al-Muraekhī reading (line for line). Note that there is a short Thamudic summary written vertically to the right.[18]

One of their salient points is that this inscription contains skeletal dots on the letters dhāl, rā' and shīn.

4. The inscription of Imru' al-Kais' tombstone at Namārah (one hundred kilometers southwest of Damascus), dated to 223 years after Bosra (c. 328 C.E.). While Gruendler regards it as Nabataean,[19] others including Cantineau and Abbott treat it as Arabic.[20]

ذي نفس مر القيس بن عمرو ملك العرب كله ذو أسر التاج
وملك الاسدين ونزرو وملوكهم وهرب محجو عكدى وجا
بزجى من حبج نجرن مدينة شمر وملك معدو ونزل بنيه
الشعوب ووكلهن فرسو لروم فلم يبلغ ملك مبلغه
عكدى هلك سنت 223 يوم 7 بكسول بلسعد ذو ولده

Figure 9.5: Arabic inscription of Imru' al-Kais at Namārah, c. 328 C.E., preserved at Musée du Lovure, followed by a line for line reading.[21]

From these examples we perceive that the dividing line between Arabic and so-called Nabataean inscriptions is very hazy indeed. The Raqūsh was reinterpreted as an Arabic text and, a year later, the find at 'En 'Avdat was declared to be the earliest dateable Arabic inscription. The great resemblance among these four inscriptions is due to their script. It is Nabataean.

ii. What Language Did the Nabataeans Speak?

Growing up in Makkah from his earliest childhood Ismā'īl, eldest son of Ibrāhīm, was raised among the Jurhum tribe and married within them twice. This tribe spoke Arabic,[22] and so undoubtedly must have Ismā'īl. The Jurhum Arabic probably lacked the sophistication and polish of the Quraishī

---

[15] J. Cantineau, op. cit., ii:38-39; Gruendler, op. cit., p. 10.

[16] Gruendler, op. cit., p. 10.

[17] See J.F. Healey and G.R. Smith, "Jaussen-Savignac 17 – The Earliest Dated Arabic Document (A.D. 276)", *al-Aṭlāl (The Journal of Saudi Arabian Archaeology)*, vol. xii, 1410 (1989), p. 77. The authors mention that this inscription has generally been classified as an Aramaic text [*ibid*, p. 77].

[18] Picture source: *ibid*, vol. xii, Plate 46. The Arabic reading is after M.K. al-Muraekhī, "Naqsh Raqūsh bil-Ḥijr (Madā'in Ṣāleḥ) 'Ru'yah Jadidah'" (Raqūsh inscription in al-Ḥijr, Madā'in Ṣāleḥ, a new reading), *Deliberations of the Scientific Meeting of the Association of History and Archaeology in the Gulf GCC*, Dubai, 1419 (1999). Note that this is a revised reading of the one provided by Healey and Smith [op. cit., p. 105 (Arabic section)].

[19] Gruendler, op. cit., pp. 11-12. The author claims that it is "the earliest extant text in the Arabic *language*, though it still uses Nabatean characters" [*ibid*, p. 11].

[20] Cantineau, op. cit., ii:49-50 (under the heading 'Textes Arabes Archaïques'); Abbott, op. cit., Plate (I – 2). Quoting Healey and Smith, "... from the time of its discovery almost, [the Namārah text] has been held up as the earliest dated Arabic inscription" ["Jaussen-Savignac 17 – The Earliest Dated Arabic Document (A.D. 276)", *al-Aṭlāl*, xii:82].

[21] Source: Cantineau, op. cit., ii:49. The inscription reading is from al-Munaggid, op. cit., p. 20, figure 9. Bellamy, revising some of the earlier readings of individual words and phrases, has come up with a new rendering of the inscription [J. Bellamy, "A New Reading of the Namārah Inscription", *JAOS*, vol. 105, no. 1 (1985), pp. 31-51].

[22] See al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, al-Anbiyā', ḥadīth no. 3364; see also Ibn Qutaiba, *al-Ma'ārif*, p. 34.

Arabic, preceding it as it did by almost two thousand years. Ibn Ushta records a statement from Ibn 'Abbās that the first person to initiate set rules for the Arabic alphabet and grammar was none other than Ismā'īl.[23] Eventually Allāh commissioned Ismā'īl as a messenger and prophet,[24] to call his people for the worship of the one true God Allāh, to establish prayers and to pay alms to the poor.[25] Since Allāh sends every messenger in the language of his own people,[26] Ismā'īl must have preached in Arabic. Genesis credits Ismā'īl with twelve sons,[27] among them Nebajoth/Nabaṭ; born and nurtured in these Arabian surroundings they must have adopted Arabic as their mother tongue. These sons may have preserved their father's message by using the prevailing Arabic script; certainly they would not have resorted to whatever script was then current in Palestine (Ibrāhīm's homeland), since two generations had already lived in Arabia. When Nabaṭ subsequently migrated northwards *he must have taken the Arabic language and alphabet with him.* His descendants were the founders of the Nabataean Kingdom (600 B.C.E – 105 C.E.).[28]

Commenting on the sounds of certain Arabic characters which are not represented in Aramaic, Gruendler declares, "As the writers of Nabataean texts *spoke Arabic*, and given the close relation between the two languages, [these writers] could find Nabataean cognates to guide them in the orthography of Arabic words with such unusual sounds".[29] Or to put it more directly, that the Nabataean language and script were in fact a form of Arabic.

If this nation spoke Arabic how did its language come to be known as Nabataean? Or does this stem from a classic tendency to mislabel[30]? If this so-called Nabataean script had been properly named as 'Arabic' or 'Nabataean Arabic' (just as we sometimes speak of 'Egyptian Arabic' or 'American English'), then the whole research may have taken a different turn, and hopefully a more correct one for that. The Arabic language and script, in their primitive forms, gave birth to the Nabataean and most probably predated the Syriac.

---

[23] As-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān*, iv:145, quoting Ibn Ushta.

[24] Qur'ān 2:135; 3:84.

[25] Qur'ān 19:54-55.

[26] Qur'ān 14:40.

[27] *King James Version*, Genesis 25:12-18.

[28] There are different opinions regarding the origins of the Nabataeans. In Jawād 'Alī's view, the Nabataeans are Arabs who are even closer to Quraish and the Ḥejāzī tribes than are the tribes of Southern Arabia. Both had common deities and their script bore a close resemblance to that which was used by the early scribes for recording the Qur'ān. (The Syrians and Nabataeans were different cultures, the latter residing not in Syria but in present-day Jordan.) According to historians Nebajoth is Nebat or Nabatian, the eldest son of Ismā'īl. These are the facts which lead Jawād 'Alī to his conclusion. [Jawād 'Alī, *al-Mufaṣṣal fī Tārīkh al-'Arab Qabl al-Islām*, iii:14.]

[29] Gruendler, *The Development of the Arabic Script*, p. 125. Italics added.

[30] Of mislabeled terms we certainly have no shortage throughout the history of Orientalism. The best known of course is the mislabeling of Muslims as 'Mohammedans', a term coined in 1681 and employed thereafter for centuries. The similar 'Mohametan' dates back even further, *c.* 1529. The earliest form in English for the name of Muhammad was Mahum (*c.* 1205), originally used confusedly for 'an idol' ["Muhammad", Online Etymology Dictionary, *etymonline.com*].

iii. The Early Arabic Language Possessed a Distinct Script and Alphabet

Turning our attention to Rev. Mingana's hypothesis that early Arabic lacked its own script and alphabet, I will present a few dated and highly developed inscriptions which clearly show otherwise. There are many Arabic inscriptions from the 6th century C.E. which very nearly approach the Arabic paleography used in the first century A.H./seventh century C.E.; my examples will progress from these into the Islamic era. The list below is not meant to be exhaustive as newer inscriptions are constantly being discovered and with each, history is partially re-written. Two recent finds have been excluded, one of which pushes the date of the earliest inscription in Arabic script to 280 C.E., since the details remain unclear.[31]

1. A pre-Islamic Arabic inscription at Jabal Ramm, about fifty kilometers east of 'Aqaba port, Jordan. At the time of its discovery in 1931 it was hailed as the oldest Arabic inscription utilizing the Arabic alphabet. It is thought that the grammar and language in this inscription is straightforward classical Arabic. Bellamy in fact maintains that the language here is closer to modern Arabic than the language of Shakespeare is to modern English.[32] Grohmann dates it between

---

[31] A new tombstone inscription was discovered in the al-'Ulā region (northwest of Arabia), of a lady that died on 26 Ayyār (May) in the year 157 after Bosra, which corresponds to 280 C.E. [Daily ar-Riyāḍ, issue 12.4.1426/20.5.2005]. The other text is the "Wā'il bin al-Jazzār inscription", a commemorative inscription dated 410 C.E. and discovered at Wādī al-Mu'tadil in the al-'Ulā region. The inscription reads (numbers in brackets refer to the lines of the inscription): "[1] ذكير وألو بر الجزز خط [2] بيرخ ايلول 305" [M.K. al-Muraekhī and 'A. Ghabbān, "Naqsh Wā'il bin al-Jazzār at-Tizkārī al-Mu'arrakh bi'ām 410", *Deliberations of the third Annual Scientific Meeting of the Association*, Muscat, Oman, 1422 (2001)]. Unfortunately no picture/tracing of either of the inscriptions was provided.

[32] J. Bellamy, "Two Pre-Islamic Arabic Inscriptions Revised: Jabal Ramm and Umm Al-Jimāl", *JAOS*, vol. 108, no. 3 (1988), pp. 369-72. The inscription reads (after Bellamy): "[1] I rose and made all sorts of money [2] which no world-weary man has [ever] collected [3] I have collected gold and silver; I announce it to those who are fed up and unwilling".

328 and 350 C.E.,[33] while Bellamy prefers to date it generally to the fourth century C.E.[34]

[قمتـ]ـو وعملتو كلنض
[لـ]ـم يجنيه بارم
جنيتو ثمرا أني أبلغه من سام وكـ[ـره]

Figure 9.6: An Arabic inscription at Jabal Ramm, c. 4th century C.E. Note that the inscription has two short Thamudic writings. Line by line reading of the Arabic text is after Bellamy.

A salient point of this inscription is that it has skeletal dots for the letters nūn (ن), jīm (ج) and yā (ي).

2. Another pre-Islamic trilingual inscription in Arabic, Greek and Syriac at Zabad, northern Syria, dated c. 512 C.E.[35]

بسم الاله شرحو بر مع قيمو بر مر القس وشرحو بر سعدو وسترو وشريحو

Figure 9.7: A trilingual inscription at Zabad, c. 512 C.E. Here only the Arabic is shown along with its transcription. Source: al-Munaggid, Etudes, *p. 21, figure 10.*

3. A pre-Islamic Arabic inscription at Jabal Asīs, one hundred and five kilometers southeast of Damascus. The date corresponds to *c.* 528 C E.[36]

ابرهيم بن مغيرة الأوسي
أرسلني الحرث الملك على
سليمن مسلحة سنت
423

Figure 9.8: An Arabic inscription at Jabal Asīs, c. 528 C.E. Source: Hamidullah, Six Originaux, *p. 60.*

---

[33] A. Grohmann, *Arabische Paläographie. II Teil: Das Schriftwesen. Die Lapidarshrift*, Wien, 1971, p. 15.

[34] Bellamy, op. cit., p. 372.

[35] S. al-Munaggid, *Etudes De Paleographie Arabe*, p. 21; see also Gruendler, op. cit., pp. 13-14.

[36] M. Hamidullah, *Six Originaux des Lettres Diplomatiques du Prophete de L'Islam*, Premiere edition, Paris 1986/1406 A.H., p. 60.

4. Ḥarrān, a pre-Islamic Arabic inscription *c.* 568 C.E.[37]

انا شرحيل بر ظلمو بنيت ذا المرطول
سنت 463 بعد مفسد
خيبر
بعم

Figure 9.9: The Ḥarrān inscription, c. 568 C.E. Source: al-Munaggid, Etudes, *p. 21, figure 11.*

5. Islamic inscription on Jabal Salaʿ, Madinah. According to Hamidullah it was probably engraved during the Battle of the Ditch, c. 5 A.H./ 626 C.E.[38]

امسى واصبح عمر
وأبوبكر يتودّعان [يتوبان؟
يتضرّعان؟]
الى الله من كل
ما يكره

Figure 9.10: Early Islamic inscription on Jabal Salaʿ, c. 5 A.H. Source: Hamidullah, Six Originaux, *p. 64.*

6. The Prophet's letter to al-Mundhir bin Sāwā,[39] governor of al-Aḥsā', c. 8-9 A.H.

---

[37] S. al-Munaggid, op. cit., p. 21.

[38] M. Hamidullah, op. cit., pp. 62-65. Translated, it reads, "[1] Night and day 'Umar [2] and Abū Bakr take shelter (?) [3] with Allāh from all [4] that He abhors".

[39] Topkapi Sarayi, item no. 21/397. See also Hamidullah, op. cit., p. 111. I accept as genuine this letter and the one to Hiraql (Heraclius), along with others authenticated by Hamidullah, from a historical viewpoint. On the other hand B. Gruendler states, "Their authenticity is more than doubtful, as they do not even display the same script" [op. cit., p. 5, footnote 16]. This is utter nonsense. The Prophet had more than sixty scribes at his disposal [see p. 72.], so of course the handwritings must differ.

Figure 9.11: Prophet's letter to al-Mundhir (note the seal of the Prophet at lower left). Reproduced with kind permission of Aksiyon newsmagazine, Turkey.

7. The Prophet's letter to Hiraql (Heraclius),[40] the Byzantine emperor.

Figure 9.12: Prophet Muḥammad's letter to Hiraql (Heraclius), the emperor of Byzantium. Source: Hamidullah, Six Originaux, *p. 149.*

These sufficiently refute Rev. Mingana's premise regarding the lack of a distinct early Arabic alphabet.

---

[40] M. Hamidullah, op. cit., p. 149. The handwriting in this letter is noticeably dissimilar from the previous one, due to the use of a different scribe.

iv. The Emergence of Various Scripts and the Issue of Dating Kūfic Muṣḥafs

Stretching from Azerbaijan and Armenia in the north to Yemen in the south, and from Libya and Egypt in the west to Persia in the east, the territories of the Islamic state received communications from the central government in Madinah in Arabic.[41] A rapid evolution of the Arabic script followed, such that we find angular and cursive (*i.e.* non-rectilinear) characters developing alongside the Ḥejāzī script at a very early stage. For instance, the tombstone of al-Ḥajrī (Figure 9.14), dated 31 A.H., is classified by some as Kūfic[42] (angular), and the papyrus dated 22 A.H. (preserved at the Austrian National Library, Figure 10.4) is in cursive.

The term Kūfic does not necessarily betoken that its birthplace was Kūfa, established during Caliph 'Umar's reign.[43] The origins of this script can be traced back to almost a century before that.[44] In Abbott's opinion Kūfa, being just a short distance south of Ḥīra, inherited the script which was prevalent there and developed it to maturity.[45] The subject of Arabic scripts is rather large and beyond the scope of this work but, as certain Orientalists have alleged that Kūfic Qur'āns can never be dated to the first century A.H.,[46] I will present a few select examples of this beautiful script.[47]

---

[41] See al-A'ẓamī, "Nash'at al-Kitāba al-Fiqhīyya", *Dirāsāt*, University of Riyāḍ, 1398 (1978), ii/2:13-24.

[42] Though I use the term 'Kūfic' here and elsewhere, as employed in academic circles, I personally have reservations about this label. The earliest scholar to write in the field of Muṣḥaf calligraphy, an-Nadīm, lists more than a dozen styles of script (*rasm al-khaṭ*) of which Kūfic is but one. Perhaps it is difficult now to define the distinguishing characteristics of each of these calligraphic styles, but it appears that modern academia, by lumping all these styles erroneously under the 'Kūfic' umbrella, has achieved simplification but lost all accuracy [See A. al-Munīf, *Dirāsa Fannīya li Muṣḥaf Mubakkir*, Riyāḍ, 1418 (1998), pp. 41-42]. In the opinion of Yūsuf Dhunnūn, the term 'Kūfic' is currently used to denote (incorrectly) all angular scripts that evolved from the base script al-Jalīl [*ibid*, p. 42]. See also N. Abbott, *The Rise of the North Arabic Script*, p. 16.

[43] The city of Kūfa was founded in 17 A.H./638 C.E. by Sa'd b. Abī Waqqāṣ.

[44] S.M. Imamuddin, *Arabic Writing and Arab Libraries*, Ta-Ha Publishers, London, 1983, p. 12; see also B. Moritz, "Arabic Writing", *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, first edition, E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1913, p. 387. Moritz conjectures that Kūfic is named after Kūfa, the first city to employ it for official use [*ibid*].

[45] N. Abbott, op. cit., p. 17. Arabs usually distinguished four different types of pre-Islamic script: al-Ḥīrī, al-Anbārī, al-Makkī and al-Madanī, named after the cities of Ḥīra, Anbār, Makkah and Madinah [A. Khatibi and M. Sijelmassi, *The Splendor of Islamic Calligraphy*, Thames and Hudson, 1994, pp. 96-97].

[46] Gruendler, *The Development of the Arabic Script*, pp. 134-35.

[47] For more examples the interested reader can consult the *islamic-awareness.org* website.

1. The earliest dated Kūfic inscription, from Qaʿ al-Muʿtadil near al-Ḥijr (Madā'in Ṣāleḥ). It is dated 24 A.H.[48]

بسم الله
أنا زهير كتبت زمن توفي عمر سنة أربع
وعشرين

Figure 9.13: The earliest dated Islamic Inscription, discovered at Qaʿ al-Muʿtadil (northwest Arabia).

The Kūfic[49] inscription reads (numbers within brackets refer to the lines of the inscription): "[1] In the name of Allāh [2] I, Zuhayr, wrote [this] at the time ʿUmar died in the year four [3] and twenty [A.H.]". What lends additional credence to this text is that Caliph ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb died on the last night of the month of Dhūl Ḥijjah of the year 23 A.H. and was buried the following day, the first of Muḥarram of the new year 24 A.H.[50]

2. Tombstone from Aswān (southern Egypt) with an inscription dated 31 A.H.[51]

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم هذا القبر
لعبد الرحمن بن خلد الحجري اللهم اغفر له
وأدخله في رحمة منك واينا معه
استغفر له إذا قرأ هذا الكتب
وقل آمين وكتب هذا ا
لكتب في جمدى الآ
خر من سنت احدى و
ثلثين

Figure 9.14: Tombstone in southern Egypt, 31 A.H. Source: Hamidullah, Six Originaux, *pp. 69-70.*

---

[48] ʿA. Ghabban, "Naqsh Zuhayr: Aqdam Naqsh Islāmī Mu'arrikh bi-Sanat 24 H", *Arabia Revue de Sabéologie*, vol. 1, 2003, pp. 293-42.

[49] I am at odds with Dr. Ghabbān in calling it a 'Kūfic inscription', as it is rather crude compared to the more refined inscriptions that appear later in time, *e.g.* Figures 9.15 – 9.18.

[50] See Daily ar-Riyāḍ, issue 10.11.1424/2.1.2004. UNESCO has recently seen fit to include this inscription in its Memory of the World Register of Documentary Collections.

[51] N. Abbott, op. cit., p. 69; also S. al-Munaggid, *Etudes De Paleographie Arabe*, p. 40.

3. An inscription in Kūfic script found on the Darb Zubayda caravan route (near Ṭā'if), containing prayer. This one is dated 40 A.H.[52]

رحمت الله وبر
كته على عبد ا
لرحمن بن خلد
بن العاص وكتب
لسنة أربعين

Figure 9.15: Attractive Kūfic inscription dated 40 A.H., with a sketch of the original and a line by line reading. Source: Al-Aṭlāl, *vol. i, Plate 49. Reproduced with their kind permission.*

4. A dated Kūfic inscription on a tombstone in Ḥalḥūl, Palestine, 55 A.H.[53]

[بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم]
الله لا اله إلا الله محمد
رسول الله هذا قبر
المالك بن الرومي بن عبد
الله الجرمي توفي
يوم الجمعة في
شهر ربيع الآخر
[من] سنة خمس وخمسين

Figure 9.16: A tombstone in Palestine, dated 55 A.H.

5. Dam of Muʿāwiya near Ṭā'if, with an inscription in unadorned Kūfic,[54] dated 58 A.H.[55]

6. A Qur'ānic verse in Kūfic script discovered near Makkah, dated 80 A.H.[56]

---

[52] A.H. Sharafaddin, "Some Islamic inscriptions discovered on the Darb Zubayda", *al-Aṭlāl*, vol. i, 1397 (1977), pp. 69-70. The inscription reads, "[1] Allāh's mercy and [2] blessing be upon ʿAbdur- [3] Raḥmān bin Khālid [4] bin al-ʿĀṣ, and written [5] in the year forty [A.H.]"

[53] ʿAbdullah al-ʿAzzah, *Naqsh Ḥalḥūl 55/674: Aqdam Naqsh fī Filasṭīn*, Kafar Kannā, 1990.

[54] Gruendler, op. cit., pp. 15-16.

[55] See Figure 10.11 and the accompanying text.

[56] S. ar-Rāshid, *Kitābāt Islāmiyya min Makkat al-Mukarrama*, Riyāḍ, 1416 (1995), pp. 160-61.

Figure 9.17: A Qur'ānic verse in Kūfic script, 80 A.H.
Source: ar-Rāshid, Kitābāt Islāmiyya, *p. 160.*

7. An inscription near Makkah based on Qur'ānic verses[57] in Kūfic script, dated 84 A.H.[58]

Figure 9.18: A beautiful Kūfic inscription dated 84 A.H.
Source: ar-Rāshid, Kitābāt Islāmiyya, *p. 26.*

---

[57] This inscription is not a Qur'ānic verse but is *derived* from two different verses (2:21 and 4:1). It could be due to a slip in the writer's memory. Quoting Bruce Metzger, "The memory can play strange tricks when one quotes even the most familiar passages. ... a remarkable instance of this in no less a person than Jeremy Taylor, who quotes the text 'Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God' nine times, yet only twice in the same form, and never once correctly" [*The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 3rd enlarged edition, Oxford Univ. Press, 1992, pp. 88-89, footnote 3].

[58] S. ar-Rāshid, op. cit., pp. 26-29.

These images along with many others[59] confirm that even in the first century A.H. the Kūfic script had achieved considerable prominence throughout the Muslim lands (Egypt, Ḥejāz, Syria, Iraq *etc.*). These inscriptions argue against Gruendler, who alleges that all Kūfic Muṣḥafs belong to the second and third century A.H.[60] Well-known by the middle of the first century, this script came to be used widely throughout the Islamic world, especially in coinage,[61] and there is no plausible reason why it had to wait a century or more before being adopted for Muṣḥafs.

3. Conclusion

Arabia's rocks are adorned with numerous examples of Arabic script beginning from the middle of the 3rd century C.E. Primitive in some respects, early Arabic nevertheless provided the impetus for the Nabataeans' own form of Arabic while its historical roots, anchored in the epoch of Ibrāhīm and Ismā'īl, predated the Aramaic. Like any other language, Arabic paleography and orthography were in a constant state of flux. The expansion of Muslim territories led to the parallel evolution of different Arabic scripts, *e.g.* Ḥejāzī, Kūfic and cursive, each with its own characteristics. None of the scripts dominated the others, and none was confined to a specific locale. With multiple examples of Kūfic script taken from first century inscriptions, we have negated the theory that Kūfic Muṣḥafs can only be dated to the second or third century A.H.

---

[59] There are many other dated examples of Kūfic inscriptions which I did not reproduce due to space considerations. Some of the more notable ones are: (1) A dated graffito from Muthallath, near Yanbu', dated 23 A.H. [M. Kawatoko, "Archaeological Survey of Najran and Madinah 2002", *al-Aṭlāl*, vol. xviii, 1426 (2005), pp. 51-52]; (2) Another graffito from Wādī Khushayba, near Najrān, dated 27 A.H. [*ibid*]; (3) Ḥafnat al-Ubyaḍ inscription near Karbala, Iraq, dated 64 A.H. [al-Munaggid, op. cit., pp. 104-5]; (4) inscriptional band of the Dome of the Rock inlaid in mosaic, Jerusalem, dated 72 A.H. [Gruendler, op. cit., pp. 17-18, 155-56]; (5) road milestone built during the reign of Caliph 'Abdul Malik (65–86 A.H.) [al-Munaggid, op. cit., p. 108].

[60] Gruendler, op. cit., pp. 134-35.

[61] Caliph 'Abdul Malik unified the coinage throughout the Islamic world in the year 77 A.H./697 C.E. [Stephen Album, *A Checklist of Islamic Coins*, 2nd edition, 1998, p. 5]. These purely epigraphic coins in gold, silver and copper bore mottos from the Qur'ān, the year in which they were struck, and in the case of silver and copper coins the name of the mint all in Kūfic script. This practice continued even after the fall of the Ummayad caliphate in 132 A.H. ["Islamic Coins – The Turath Collection Part I", *Spink*, London, 25 May 1999, Sale No. 133].

CHAPTER TEN

ARABIC PALEOGRAPHY AND ORTHOGRAPHY IN THE QUR᾽ĀN

The lapse of years and ripening of young nations can cause dramatic changes in spelling conventions, retaining certain peculiarities from the past while others evolve or become obsolete. Back in 1965 while I was working towards my PhD at Cambridge, I came across a young British student who was studying Arabic to be an Orientalist by profession. He complained about the absurdity of Arabic orthography and how difficult it was to master, insisting that the Arabs ought to switch to Latin script – as was the case in modern day Turkey – which made more 'sense'. I countered him with the absurdity of the *a* sound in *father, fat, fate, shape*; and *u* in *put, but*; not to mention *right* and *write*, and the past and present tenses of *read*. A plethora of examples were burning holes in my pockets from my sheer frustrations while learning English as a third language. He argued that these irregularities were owing to individual words and their historical development, but he seemed to overlook that if English had the unquestionable right to these peculiarities then it was only fair that the same be afforded to Arabic.

Below I have provided the verbatim title of a randomly chosen (and typically verbose) English treatise from the 17th century C.E., to illustrate the orthographic changes that have taken place in under four centuries.

> The Boy of Bilson: or, A True Discovery of the late notorious Impostures of *certaine* Romish Priests in their pretended *Exorcisme*, or expulsion of the *Divell* out of a young boy, named William Perry, *sonne* of Thomas Perry of Bilson, in the country of Stafford, Yeoman. Upon which occasion, hereunto is permitted A *briefe* Theological Discourse, by way of Caution, for the more *easie* discerning of such Romish spirits; and *iudging* of their false pretences, both in this and the like Practices.[1]

---

[1] Peter Milward, *Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age (A Survey of Printed Soures)*, The Scolar Press, London, 1978, p. 197. This is the actual title of a book published in 1622 C.E. I have italicized the words that are spelled differently from our current standard. Notice that 'judging' is written with an 'i' instead of 'j'. Interestingly, the letter 'j' came into existence only recently (*c.* 16th or 17th century), after the invention of the printing press. [See "How Was Jesus Spelled?", *Biblical Archaeology Review*, May/June 2000, vol. 26, no. 3, p. 66.]

The spelling may seem inept by our current criteria, but it is in complete accordance with the established standards of 17th century England. This shift in spelling or 'spelling reform', as it is fashionably known, is the rule for almost all languages and not the exception. The English language is sorted into Old English, Middle English, Early Modern English and Modern English, now further split into the American and British spelling systems. For example 'cwēn', an Old English word, changed to 'quene' in Middle English and later became 'queen'.[2] The German language has experienced several spelling reforms, the latest one in 1996. The new orthography is only obligatory in schools, outside of which everyone can write as before as there is no law ruling orthography.[3] In its 1948 reform the Danish language abandoned the diphthong Aa/aa in favor of the Swedish letter Å/å, and in 1980 it recognized 'W' as a distinct letter whereas before it was considered a variation of 'V'. All words were re-alphabetized accordingly. And only in 2008 did the letter 'W' enter the Swedish alphabet.

Another interesting fact is that standardized spellings are a modern phenomenon. Variant spellings of a single word were not uncommon in the not so distant past. Until 1901 the German language was devoid of a unified set of spelling rules.[4] The same holds true for English. Figure 10.1 is the opening of St. John's Gospel from the 1526 William Tyndale translation of the Bible.[5] Even on this lone page we spot variances: the word

---

[2] "Queen", *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, 4th edition, Houghton Mifflin Company, 2000. The Old English 'mūs', as another example, became 'mous' (Middle English) and finally 'mouse'.

[3] This is according to the 14 July 1998 ruling of the Federal Constitutional Court of Germany, whose stated goal was to simplify spelling and hence make it easier to learn, without substantially altering the familiar rules of the German language. A similar case is found in the 1995 Dutch spelling reform, where a "Green Booklet" reform was introduced but then hastily succeeded by a "White Booklet" due to a backlash. Both spelling systems are in use, one by schools and officials (the 'green' one) while the 'white' one is favored by newspapers, magazines and TV stations.

[4] Prior to 1901, spelling variations were common in German. 'Thor' and 'Tor' for example were equally acceptable variants for the word meaning 'gate'. Local dialects often affected the spelling in genealogical records and the following letters were sometimes used interchangeably: *p* used for *b* (*e.g.* Waldpurga for Walburga); *a* used for *e*; *t* used for *d* or *dt*; *ck* used for *k* (*e.g.* Burckhart for Burkhard); *y* used for *i* or *j* (*e.g.* Freytag for Freitag); *t* used for *th* ... *etc.*

[5] *The New Testament 1526 Translated by William Tyndale (Original Spelling Edition)*, Edited by W.R. Cooper, The British Library, 2000, inside cover. For his translation the Church condemned Tyndale as a heretic. He was strangled and burned outside Brussels in 1536. According to Cooper, in 1274 a Latin Bible would cost about £30. In that period a laboring man earned about £2 a year if he toiled the whole year without a break. Tyndale's translated Bible was sold for approximately £0.13, a price easily affordable even for the working class [*ibid*, Introduction, pp. xiv-xv].

that is spelled in two alternate ways, 'that' and 'thatt'; *with* is spelled 'with' and 'wyth'; and *of* is given as both 'of' and 'off'.

cxix.

The Goſpell off

Sancte Jhon.

The fyrſt Chapter.

N the begynnynge
was that worde/ ād that
worde was with god: and god
was thatt worde. The ſame
was in the begynnynge wyth
god. All thyngſ were made by
it/ and with out it/ was made
noo thīge/ that made was. In
it was lyfe/ And lyfe was the
light of mē/ And the light ſhy
neth ī darcknes/ ād darcknes cōprehēded it not.
There was a mā ſent from god/ whoſe name
was Jhon. The ſame cā as a witnes/ to beare

Figure 10.1: The opening of St. John's Gospel in the 1526 W. Tyndale English Bible. Note that the word that *is spelled as 'that' (fifth line from top) and 'thatt' (seventh line from top); the word* with *is spelled as 'with' (sixth line from top) and 'wyth' (eighth line from top); and the word* of *is spelled 'off' (topmost line) and 'of' (thirteenth line from top). Courtesy of British Library.*

In some languages certain characters enjoy dual functions; the letters *i* and *u* were used as both vowels and consonants in Latin,[6] with the consonantal *i* being pronounced as 'y' in *yes*. The letter *b* was pronounced 'p' if followed by *s* (*e.g.* absturi = apstuli), otherwise it was akin to the English 'b'.[7] In German the letter *b* is pronounced either as 'b' in *ball* (when initial) or as 'p' in *tap* (when being last in a word or syllable), while *d* is pronounced either as 'd' or 't'. The letter *g* can elicit six different sounds according to the local dialect.

The same phenomenon exists in Arabic. Some tribes pronounced the word حتى (*ḥattā*) as عتى (*'attā*), and صراط (*ṣirāṭ*) as سراط (*sirāṭ*), *etc.*, and this was the root cause of many of the known variants in recitation. Similarly the letter: ا, و, ي have the dual function of consonant and vowel, as in Latin. The question of how early Arab writers and copyists used these three letters requires special attention. Their methods, though puzzling to us now, were straightforward enough to them.

---

[6] F.L. Moreland and R.M. Fleischer, *Latin: An Intensive Course*, p. 1.

[7] *ibid*, p. 2.

From this introduction let us delve into the system of Arabic orthography during the early centuries of Islam.

1. Writing Styles During the Time of the Prophet

In Madinah the Prophet had an enormous number of scribes originating from various tribes and localities, accustomed to different dialects and spelling conventions. For example, Yaḥyā says that he witnessed a letter dictated by the Prophet to Khālid b. Sa'īd b. al-'Āṣ which contained a few peculiarities: كان (*kāna*) was written كون (*kawana*), and حتى (*ḥattā*) was spelled حتا.[8] Another document, handed by the Prophet to Razīn bin Anas as-Sulamī, also spelled كان as كون.[9] The use of double *yā* (يـيـ), which has long since been contracted into a single *yā*, is evident in بايىد,[10] and عسره (as shown without skeletal dots) in the Prophet's letters.[11] A document from the third century A.H. draws a couple of letters in multiple ways.[12] There is no shortage of evidence regarding the variance in writing styles during the early days of Islam.

2. Studies on the Orthography of 'Uthmān's Muṣḥaf

i. Irregularities in the Writing of Alif

Numerous books allude to the spelling peculiarities found in 'Uthmān's Muṣḥaf, with some of the more detailed ones analyzing all instances of spelling anomalies. Among the chapters in *al-Muqni'*, for example, one bears the heading, "Examination of Muṣḥaf spellings where [vowels are] dropped or listed. [Subheading:] Examination of words where *alif* is dropped for abbreviation". Ad-Dānī quotes Nāfi' bin Abī Nu'aim (*c.* 70-167 A.H.), the original author, to produce a list of the verses where *alif* is pronounced but not written:

---

[8] For details see Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *al-Maṣāḥif*, p. 104.

[9] *ibid*, p. 105.

[10] Qur'ān 51:47.

[11] M. Hamidullah, *Six Originaux Des Lettres Du Prophete De L'Islam*, Premiere edition, Paris 1986/1406 A.H., pp. 127-33.

[12] See the discussion on the *Gharīb al-Ḥadīth* manuscript in pp. 163 - 65.

Sūra:verse	The spelling used in 'Uthmān's Muṣḥaf	Actual pronunciation
2:9	يخدعون الله	يخادعون الله
2:51	وإذ وعدنا موسى	وإذ واعدنا موسى
20:80	ووعدنكم	وواعدناكم

These three instances I chose arbitrarily, otherwise the examples in his book occupy the length of twenty pages. Additionally, *alif* in 'Uthmān's Muṣḥaf is universally removed from السموت and سموت (a total of 190 occurrences), except in verse 41:12 where it is spelled السموات.[13] Randomly perusing the present-day Muṣḥaf printed by the King Fahd Complex in Madinah, I have verified this one instance of anomalous spelling, and so far have found nothing in my cursory searches to contradict Nāfi''s tabulated results.[14] The two remaining vowels along with the *hamza* (ء) also display a dynamic tendency for change, one which is not limited to 'Uthmān's Muṣḥaf. Of the Companions who penned their own private copies many incorporated additional peculiarities based, perhaps, on regional differences in spelling. Here are two examples:

(a) 'Abdul-Fattāḥ ash-Shalabī discovered an old Qur'ānic manuscript in which the scribe used two different spellings of على (*i.e.* على and علا) on the same page.[15]

(b) In the Raza Library Collection, Rampur, India, there is a Muṣḥaf written in Kūfic script attributed to 'Alī bin Abī Ṭālib. The word على is again spelled as علا, and حتى is spelled as حتا. I have provided a sample page below.[16]

---

[13] Ad-Dānī, *al-Muqni'*, pp. 20-27. The printed edition lists the wrong word for verse 2:9, which has been corrected in the table.

[14] The copy I used, which is well known throughout the world, is without doubt one of the most accurate printings of the Muṣḥaf and for this the complex deserves our due congratulations and gratitude.

[15] Ash-Shalabī, *Rasm al-Muṣḥaf*, pp. 72-73. In a similar case, the Muṣḥaf of 'Alqama (*d.* after 60 A.H./679 C.E.), brought to light by Ibrāhīm an-Nakha'ī (*d.* 96 A.H.), spelled the letter *alif* both in the traditional form and in the form of the letter *ya'* – meaning that certain words with *alif* had two interchangeable forms (*e.g.* حتا and حتى). I also came across another Muṣḥaf folio from the first century A.H. where in the same page, the same word had been written in two different ways.

[16] For another sample page of the same Muṣḥaf, see Dr. W.H. Siddiqui and A.S. Ilahi, *Hindi-Urdu Catalogue of the exhibition held on the occasion of the celebration of the 50th Anniversary of India's Independence and 200 years of Rampur Raza Library*, 2000, Plate No. 1.

Figure 10.2: The Kūfic Muṣḥaf attributed to ʿAlī bin Abī Ṭālib, where حتى *is spelled* حتا *(seventh line from the top) and* على *is spelled* علا *(fourth line from the bottom). Courtesy Rampur Raza Library, India.*

Mālik bin Dīnār reports that ʿIkrima recited verse 17:107 as *fas'al* (فسأل), though it is written *fsl* (فسل). Mālik reconciled this by saying that it was the same as reading *qāl* (قال) when the word is spelled *ql* (قل),[17] which is a common abbreviation in the Ḥejāzī Muṣḥaf.[18] Given that reading and recitation were based on an oral learning tradition, such shorthand did not threaten to corrupt the holy text. If a teacher recited قالوا (read as *qālū*, the *alif* at the end being silent due a grammatical rule) and the student scribed it as قلو (following his own conventions) but read it back correctly as قالوا, then the anomalous vowel spelling bore no ill consequences.

Ibn Abī Dāwūd narrates the following incident:

> قال: حدثني يزيد الفارسي، قال: زاد عبيد الله بن زياد في المصحف ألفي حرف. فلما قدم الحجاج بن يوسف بلغه ذلك، فقال: من ولّى ذلك لعبيد الله؟
>
> قالوا: ولّى ذاك له يزيد الفارسي، فأرسل إليّ، فانطلقت إليه، وأنا لا أشك أن سيقتلني. فلما دخلت عليه، قال: ما بال ابن زياد زاد في المصحف ألفي حرف؟
>
> قال، قلت: أصلح الله الأمير، أنه وُلِدَ بِكلاء البصرة، فتوالت تلك عني.
>
> قال: صدقت، فخلا عني.

---

[17] See Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *al-Maṣāḥif*, p. 105 (the printed text has been corrected). Teachers and students were bound to teach, learn and read orally according to the *isnāds* (which emanated directly from the Prophet) and within the boundaries of the ʿUthmānī Muṣḥaf's consonantal text. Mālik bin Dīnār's reading was both true to the consonantal text and to the *ḥadīths* on which he based his recitation.

[18] See for example F. Déroche and S.N. Noseda, *Sources de la transmission manuscrite du texte Coranique, Les manuscrits de style higazi, Volume 2, tome 1. Le manuscrit Or. 2165 (f. 1 à 61) de la British Library*, Lesa, 2001, p. 54a.

> وكان الذي زاد عبيد الله في المصحف كان مكانه في المصحف «قلو» قاف لام واو، «كنو» كاف نون واو، فجعلها عبيد الله «قالوا» قاف ألف لام واو ألف، وجعل «كانوا» كاف ألف نون واو ألف.[19]
>
> Yazīd al-Fārsī said, "ʿUbaidullāh bin Ziyād had two thousand extra letters (حرف) added to his Muṣḥaf. When al-Ḥajjāj bin Yūsuf arrived in Baṣra and heard this, he inquired, 'Who carried out this alteration for ʿUbaidullāh?' They replied, 'Yazīd al-Fārsī'. Al-Ḥajjāj therefore summoned me; I went to see him and had no doubt that he intended to kill me. When I stood in his presence he asked, 'How is it with ʿUbaidullāh, adding two thousand letters to the Muṣḥaf?' I replied, 'May Allāh keep you on the right path; he was raised up in the lowly community of Baṣra [*i.e.* far from the learned areas, in a region lacking literary taste and sophistication]'. 'You have spoken the truth,' he answered, and let me go. What ʿUbaidullāh wanted was simply to standardize the spelling within his Muṣḥaf, re-writing «قلو» as «قالوا», and «كنو» as «كانوا»".

As the matter did not involve corrupting the text but rather reinstating some vowels which had been dropped for abbreviation, al-Fārsī left al-Ḥajjāj's company unscathed. Referring to the concordance of the Qur'ān we note that قالوا occurs 331 times, while كانوا occurs 267 times: a combined total of 598 words. Recall that ʿUbaidullāh added two extra *alifs* in each of these, amounting to approximately 1,200 extra letters. The figure of two thousand (as stated in the narrative) was probably a rough guess.

Ibn Abī Dāwūd's account bears a defective and weak *isnād*,[20] giving scholars enough cause to reject it. But even if it were genuine, ʿUbaidullāh was only guilty of tampering with his own copy so as to bring it in accordance with the prevalent spelling conventions, nothing more. For another example we turn to the Muṣḥaf copied by Ibn al-Bawwāb in 391 A.H./1000 C.E., which I have compared against the Muṣḥaf printed in Madinah in 1407 A.H./1987 C.E.

Muṣḥaf of Ibn al-Bawwāb	Muṣḥaf of Madinah
أبصارهم	أبصٰرهم
شياطينهم	شيٰطينهم
طغيانهم	طغيٰنهم
ظلمات	ظلمٰت

---

[19] Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *al-Maṣāḥif*, p. 117. The printed text has been corrected.

[20] The chain of witnesses who were involved in transmitting the event; see Chapter 13 for a detailed discussion of the *isnād* system and the ranking of narrators.

The very beginning of *Sūra al-Baqara* alone provides these four instances. The custom for most printed Muṣḥafs now is to adhere faithfully to the ʿUthmāni spelling system; the word مالك (*mālik*) for instance is written ملك (*malik*) following the ʿUthmāni orthography, though a tiny *alif* is placed after the *mīm* to clarify the pronunciation for the contemporary reader. Similarly a few verses still spell قال as قل,[21] indicating that this abbreviation was valid in ʿUthmān's time and that he allowed the inclusion of both.

Modern publishers, by basing their copies on the official ʿUthmāni orthography, have provided us with a rich reference point for the spelling conventions of Islam's first century. And it is indeed the best option for every publisher, given the benefits of mass printing and the (roughly) standardized nature of modern education. The reluctance to deviate from ʿUthmān's orthography is nothing new however. Imām Mālik (*d.* 179 A.H.) was solicited over twelve centuries ago for his legal opinion (فتوى) on whether one should copy the Muṣḥaf afresh by utilizing the latest spelling conventions; he resisted the idea, approving it only for school children. Elsewhere ad-Dānī (*d.* 444 A.H.) maintained that all scholars from Mālik's time to his unanimously shared this same conviction.[22]

> سُئل مالك عن الحروف تكون في القرآن مثل الواو والألف أترى أن تُغيِّر من المصحف إذا وجدت فيه كذلك؟
>
> قال: لا.
>
> قال أبو عمرو: يعني الواو والألف الزائدتين في الرسم، المعدومتين في اللفظ، نحو الواو في ... «الربوا» وشبهه، ونحو الألف في ... «أو لا أذبحنه» ... وشبهه، وكذلك الياء في نحو ... «أفإينْ مت» وما أشبهه.[23]

Imām Mālik was approached about certain vowels in the Muṣḥaf which are silent; he dismissed the idea of eliminating them. Abū ʿAmr (ad-Dānī) comments, "This refers to the extraneous and silent *wāw* and *alif*, such as *wāw* in ... الربوا, *alif* in ... أو لا أذبحنه, and also the *ya*ʾ in ... أفإينْ مت. This indicates that Imām Mālik was critical of any institutionalized updating; while scribes may have chosen to incorporate different conventions in their own copies, in his mind such conventions were never to receive precedence or sanction over ʿUthmān's orthography.

ii. *Irregularities of Alif in the Ṣanʿāʾ Fragments and their Orthographic Impact*

Irregularities in the ʿUthmāni Muṣḥaf involving *alif* are not limited to it being dropped; a further aspect of this irregularity is that the *alif* can instead be written as a *ya*ʾ without dots (*i.e.* on a 'seat'), or as a *wāw*. The latter is seldom encountered but in such words as الصلوٰة and الزكوٰة. The former is quite common however, in fact looking into a single page of the printed Muṣḥaf we hit upon the following examples: مأويٰهم, موليٰكم, أريٰكم and أخريٰكم.[24] In each case the standard character shape of *alif* is replaced by a 'seat' (hooklet), such as that found for *ya*ʾ but without dots.[25] As the oral transmission of the Qurʾān dictates which of these seats is an *alif* the pronunciation is never in doubt.

G.R. Puin, finding that a few Ṣanʿāʾ fragments use this peculiarity in places where most known manuscripts have instead dropped the *alif* for brevity, claims that he has uncovered an ancient orthographic layer unknown to Arab scholars of the Qurʾān. He cites only one example: لا إليٰه إلا هو إليه المصير.[26] The conventional spelling for this verse is لا إله إلا هو إليه المصير.[27] In other words the usual spelling for إله is amended by adding an extra seat for the dropped *alif*, إليٰه. From this one instance Puin makes a far-reaching extrapolation, that at some phase of the Qurʾān's development the Arabs failed to realize that a *ya*ʾ should render nothing but an *alif*. This phenomenon, he concludes, can be applied to the Qurʾānic text as necessary to clear up 'dark' passages which, as far as he is concerned, have not been adequately explained by traditional commentaries.[28] This can also be used to move the text closer to, as he feels, Judeo-Christian reality. By swapping the *ya*ʾ for an *alif* he dispenses with shayṭān (شيطان) and Ibrahīm (إبراهيم),

---

[21] See for example Qurʾān 23:112, 23:114 and 43:24.

[22] Ad-Dānī, *al-Muqniʿ*, p. 19. Some scholars have suggested that the Muṣḥaf be written in accordance with their period's prevailing conventions. One such scholar is ʿIzz bin ʿAbdus-Salām [az-Zarakhshī, *Burhān*, i:379]. Others include Ibn Khaldūn, who favors change [Shalabī, *Rasm al-Muṣḥaf*, p. 119]; Ḥifnī Naṣīf, who is against any change [*ibid*, p. 118]; the Azhar's *fatwā* board, which decided to uphold the early orthographic system [*ibid*, p. 118]; and the Saudi committee of major ʿulema, who also decided in 1979 to preserve the old system. A similar consensus was reached by the World Muslim League [al-Finaisān (ed.), *al-Badiʿ*, Introduction, p. 41].

[23] Ad-Dānī, *al-Muqniʿ*, p. 36.

[24] Qurʾān 3:150-53. In the printed Muṣḥaf each of these contains a small *alif* to aid pronunciation, and there are no dots associated with *ya*ʾ (although I have included them here as my software will not let me do otherwise).

[25] Modern Arabic still utilizes this irregularity, albeit only when *alif* is the final letter in a word (such as يخشى, مثوى, على and حتى), whereas in the ʿUthmānic convention *alif* may also be in the middle for this phenomenon to occur. For purposes of this discussion I have ignored the shape of the *alif* at the end of a word, as it is a simplified subset of the second category.

[26] Gerd-Rüdiger Puin, "Neue Wege der Koranforschung II: Über die Bedeutung der ältesten Koranfragmente aus Sanaa (Jemen) für die Orthographiegeschichte des Korans", *Magazin Forschung*, January 1999, p. 39.

[27] Qurʾān 40:3.

[28] G.-R Puin, op. cit., p. 40.

obtaining instead Saṭān and Abraham which he finds much more biblical and to his liking. To him this is proof that the Arabs were not conversant with their own orthography.[29]

A seat however may represent not only *ya'* or *alif*, but several other letters besides: ب, ت, ث and ن. The earliest Muslims, reading from dotless Muṣḥafs, were able to decipher which of these possibilities applied to each seat based on the Qur'ān's oral transmission, including whether a seat was simply an irregular *alif*.[30] The thousands of instances of this irregularity which have found their way into our printed Muṣḥafs, prove that Muslims were always conscious of this phenomenon, though at the same time whether a seat represents an irregular *alif* or another character has always depended on oral transmission and not, as Puin does, on a person's own whim.[31] His is an irrational approach. Taking a well recognized orthographic rule, however irregular but backed by oral tradition, and corrupting it to justify wholesale word alterations for doctrinal reasons of moving the Qur'ān closer to the Bible, is totally unscientific and hollow.

If the representation of vowels in Ṣan'ā' or elsewhere is more irregular than 'Uthmān's official Muṣḥaf, what impact can this have on our understanding of the holy text? I have pointed out above that whatever orthography a scribe uses for penning the Qur'ān is unimportant, so long as he is able to correctly decipher the text afterwards. If in Yemen لا إلٰيه was a customary means of writing لا إله, or if other localities exhibited other slightly different orthographic practices than the Ḥejāzī standard, that would not constitute tampering, so long as the consonantal text remained fixed and the pronunciation was in keeping with the authorized transmission chains.

---

[29] *ibid*, p. 40. We can consider an analogy in English. As is well known there are differences between standard British and American spellings, among the most common of which is the presence of an extra 'u' in such words as colour, humour and honour in the British system. But suppose we find a British manuscript which goes a bit further, taking words that are not known to fit this pattern and rewriting them, such that 'tutor' becomes 'tutour'. Puin's unsound methodology can then take this as a stepping stone, arguing that wherever 'ou' occurs we can omit the 'u' if deemed necessary. Thus it becomes all too easy to play around with meanings, changing "he went sailing but was not found" to "he went sailing but was not *fond*". The context is altered completely. Or, "she is determined to marry her cousin, our Prince Henry" to "she is determined to marry her cousin, *or* Prince Henry". Again the entire meaning in mangled.

[30] This topic is covered in greater depth in Chapter 12.

[31] Puin even quotes the word Torah, written as توريٰة but always pronounced توراة, which itself contradicts his allegation that Arabs did not know a seat can be an *alif* [Puin, op. cit., p. 40].

3. The Nuqaṭ (Dotting) Scheme in Early Muṣḥafs

From orthography we now switch our focus to paleography.[32] Just as in the previous chapter we placed Arabic paleography in a historical perspective, so now we place it in the context of the Qur'ān and examine its development. Much of this discussion will revolve around *nuqaṭ* (نقط: dots), which in the early days of Islam embodied a dual meaning:

1. Skeletal dots:
   These are dots placed either over or under a letter to differentiate it from others sharing the same skeleton, such as *ḥā* (ح), *khā* (خ) and *jīm* (ج). Known as *nuqaṭ al-i'jām* (نقط الإعجام), this system was familiar to Arabs prior to Islam or, at the latest, in Islam's youth—preceding 'Uthmān's Muṣḥaf as we will soon demonstrate.

2. Diacritical marks:
   Known in Arabic as *tashkīl* (تشكيل: *i.e. ḍamma, fatḥa, kasra*) or *nuqaṭ al-i'rāb* (نقط الإعراب);[33] these can take the form of dots or more conventional markings, and were invented by Abū al-Aswad ad-Du'alī (*c.* 10 B.H. - 69 A.H./611 - 688 C.E.).[34]

We will cover both schemes at length.

i. Early Arabic Writings and Skeletal Dots

The *rasm al-khaṭ* (lit: the drawing of the script) in the 'Uthmānī Muṣḥaf does not contain dots to differentiate such characters as *bā* (ب), *tā* (ت), and so on. Neither does it possess diacritical marks such as *fatḥa*, *ḍamma* and *kasra*. There is a good deal of evidence that the concept of skeletal dots was not new to the Arabs, being familiar even prior to Islam. Whatever the philosophy may have been with regards to their exclusion from the earliest Muṣḥafs,[35] I will introduce several examples to prove that early Arabic paleography did recognize dots associated with particular characters. Again, the examples below are not meant to be exhaustive as this is not the focus of this book, however they do serve the purpose of our argument.[36]

---

[32] As a reminder: orthography refers to spelling conventions, while paleography (in this context) deals with a language's script, with the shape of its letters and the placement of dots *etc.*

[33] These are meant to represent short vowel sounds. Yet another name is *al-ḥaraka* (الحركة), and in Urdu they are known as zair, zabar, paish *etc.*

[34] Ad-Dānī, *al-Muḥkam*, p. 6. A renowned author, ad-Du'alī wrote his treatise on grammar (and invented *tashkīl*) probably around 20 A.H./640 C.E.

[35] See pp. 103 - 04. for a discussion on the motive. Whether it caused divergences in the readings of the Qur'ān is the subject of Chapter 12.

1. The Raqūsh tombstone, the second oldest dated pre-Islamic Arabic inscription (Figure 9.4), *c.* 267 C.E., contains dots on the letters *dhāl* (ذ), *rā'* and *shīn* (ش).
2. A pre-Islamic Arabic inscription at Jabal Ramm (Figure 9.6), *c.* fourth century C.E. It contains skeletal dots on the letters *nūn* (ن), *jīm* (ج) and *yā* (ي).
3. An inscription, most probably pre-Islamic, at Sakākā (northern Arabia), written in a curious script.

Figure 10.3: An inscription found at Sakākā. Source: Winnet and Reed, Ancient Records from North Arabia, *Figure 8. Reprinted with the publisher's kind permission.*

The inscription (supposedly a combination of Nabataean and Arabic characters)[37] contains dots associated with the Arabic letters *nūn* (ن), *bā* (ب) and *tā* (ت).

4. A bilingual document on papyrus, dated 22 A.H.,[38] part of the Erzherog Rainer Papyrus Collection at Österreichische Nationalbibliothek in Vienna. Discovered in Egypt in 1877, the papyrus exhibits both the Islamic date (month of Jamād al-'Ulā from the year 22 [A.H.]) and the Coptic equivalent (30th Pharmouthi of the indiction year 1), confirming the traditional Islamic date of Hijra.

Figure 10.4: A dated bilingual document from Egypt. Source: Austrian National Library, Rainer Papyrus Collection, P. Vindob G 39726. Reprinted with their kind permission.

Figure 10.5: The final line reads, "month of Jumādā al-'Ulā from the year 22[A.H.] and written [by] Ibn Ḥudaida."

This document hails from the reign of Caliph 'Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb. The following Arabic characters have dots: *nūn* (ن), *khā* (خ), *jīm* (ج), *dhāl* (ذ), *shīn* (ش) and *zā* (ز).

5. A parchment fragment on papyrus, also dated 22 A.H.,[39] preserved at Staatsbibliothek, Berlin. Dots can be seen on the characters *nūn* (ن) and *fā* (ف).

... ونصف ... فى ...
سنة اثنتين وعشرين

Figure 10.6: Another dated Arabic parchment along with the transcription (line by line). Source: State Library of Berlin, P. Berol 15002. Reprinted with their kind permission

---

[36] Many new inscriptions are routinely coming to light. Readers may consult *islamic-awareness.org* for many more examples.

[37] F.V. Winnett and W.L. Reed, *Ancient Records from North Arabia*, University of Toronto Press, 1970, p. 11.

[38] M. Hamidullah, *Six Originaux des Lettres Diplomatiques du Prophete de L'Islam*, pp. 44-45; S. al-Munaggid, *Etudes De Paleographie Arabe*, Dār al-Kitāb al-Jadīd, Beirut, 1972, pp. 102-3; see also A. Jones, "The dotting of a script and the dating of an era: the strange neglect of PERF 558", *Islamic Culture*, vol. 72, 1998, pp. 95-103. The Arabic part of the document reads (translation): "[1] In the name of Allāh, the Compassionate, the Merciful. This is what has been taken by 'Abdallāh [2] Son of Jābir, and his companions-in-arms, of slaughter sheep at Heracleopolis. We have taken [3] from a representative of Theodorakios, second son of Apa Kyros, and from a substitute of Christophoros, eldest son of Apa Kyros, fifty sheep as of slaughter sheep [4] and fifteen other sheep. He gave them, for slaughter, for the crew of his vessels, as well as his cavalry and his breast plated infantry in [5] the month of Jumādā the first in the year twenty-two and written by Ibn Ḥudaida". Numbers inside square brackets correspond to the inscription line number.

[39] A. Grohmann, *Handbuch der Orientalistik. Erste Abteilung: Der Nahe und der Mittlere Osten. Ergänzungsband II, Erster Halbband, I Arabische Choronolgie, II Arabische Papyruskunde*, E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1966, Plate II:2.

6. A papyrus fragment of an edict, dated by Grohmann to *c.* 25-30 A.H.,[40] preserved at Österreichische Nationalbibliothek in Vienna. Dotting is visible on the letter *nūn* (ن).
7. An inscription at Wādī Sabeel in the Najrān Area (southwestern Arabia), dated 46 A.H., contains a dot on the letter *bā* (ب).[41]

اللهم
اغفر لعبد ا[لـلـ]ـه بن ديرام
كتب لاربعة ليل خلون من
محرم من سنة ست وار
بعين

Figure 10.7: Inscription dated 46 A.H. at Wādī Sabeel along with the transcription (line by line). A dot appears under the letter bā of the word "Arbaʿīn" (last line).

8. A bilingual entagion on papyrus, dated 54 A.H.[42] and uncovered during excavations at ʿAuja Ḥafīr, in Negev close to the Egyptian border. Dots appear on the letters *bā* (ب), *thā* (ث), *qāf* (ق) and *zā* (ز).

[بسـ]ـم الله الرحمن الرحيم
[مـ]ـن الحرث بن عبد الى اهل نصان
[من كـ]ـورة غزة من اقليم الحلوص
[فاعطو]ا عسر عدى بن خلد من بنى
[سعد بن مـ]ـلك رزق ذ[ى] القعدة و
[المحرم وصـ]ـفر [وشهـ]ـرى ربيع
[سبعين مـ]ـدى قمح وثله زيـ[ـتـ]ـا و
[كتـ]ـب ابو سعيد فى ذى القعدة
من سنة اربع وخمسين

Figure 10.8: A dated bilingual entagion on papyrus from Negev along with the transcription (line by line). The last two lines read, "... month of Dhūl Qiʿda of the year 54 [a.h.]"

---

[40] *Ibid*, Plate II:3.

[41] A. Grohmann, "Arabic Inscriptions", in *Expédition Philby-Ryckmans-Lippens en Ar-bie, IIe partie: textes épigraphiques*, tome 1, Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain, 1962, p. 124, Plate XXIII. The inscription reads (translation): "[1] O Allāh [2] grant pardon to ʿAbdullāh bin Dīrām. [3] Written with four nights elapsed from [4] [the month of] Muḥarram of the year six and [5] forty".

[42] A. Grohmann, "Zum Papyrusprotokoll in früharabischer Zeit," In: *Jahrbücher der Österreichischen Byzantinischen Gesellschaft*, vol. ix, Graz-Cologne, 1960, pp. 5-9. See also H.I. Bell, "The Arabic Bilingual Entagion", *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 89, no. 3 (Oct. 1945), pp. 538-39. According to Bell, an *entagion* is an order for the payment of taxes, the delivery of supplies, or the execution of work, addressed to the people of a village and enclosed with the governor's letter in which the service was ordered. [*ibid*, p. 531].

9. Another bilingual papyrus dated by Grohmann to *c.* 22-54 A.H.,[43] preserved at the Main Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. Dots are associated with the letters *nūn* (ن), *qāf* (ق) and *zā* (ز).

Figure 10.9: An undated bilingual papyrus, c. 22-54 A.H.

10. A dam commissioned by Muʿāwiya (*d.* 60 A.H./679 C.E.) to the east of Madinah at Wādī al-Ḥanaq carries an inscription that appends dots to the letter *tā* (ت).[44]

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
هذا السد لعبد الله
معوية امير المؤمنين
اللهم برك له فيه رب
السموت والأرض
بنه أبو رداد مولى
عبد الله بن عباس بحو
ل الله وقوته
وقام عليه كثير بن ا
لصلت وأبو موسى

Figure 10.10: Outline of the inscription (undated) on the dam of Muʿāwiya near Madinah along with a line by line transcription.

11. Another dam of Muʿāwiya, located to the northeast of Ṭā'if and bearing an inscription dated 58 A.H.

هذا السد لعبد الله معوية
امير المؤمنين بنه عبد الله بن صخر
باذن الله لسنة ثمن وخمسين ا
للهم اغفر لعبد الله معوية ا
مير المؤمنين وثبته وانصره ومتع ا
لمؤمنين به كتب عمرو بن حباب

Figure 10.11: Inscription dated 58 A.H. on the dam of Muʿāwiya near Ṭā'if along with transcription (line by line).

---

[43] A. Grohmann, *Handbuch der Orientalistik. I Arabische Choronolgie, II Arabische P-pyruskunde*, op. cit., Plate III:1.

[44] S. ar-Rāshid, *Dirāsāt fī al-Āthār al-Islāmiyyah al-Mubakkirah bi al-Madinah al-M-nawwarah*, Riyāḍ, 1421 (2000), pp. 46-60. The dam has been damaged due to seismic and volcanic activities which the area suffered a long time ago [*ibid*, pp. 42-43]. The inscription is currently preserved at the National Archeological Museum in Riyadh.

> The following characters have dots: *yā* (ي), *bā* (ب), *nūn* (ن), *thā* (ث), *khā* (خ), *fā* (ف) and *tā* (ت).[45]

In view of the above we can conclude that, up until 58 A.H., the following letters had been assigned dots to differentiate them from others bearing the same skeletal shape: *nūn* (ن), *khā* (خ), *jīm* (ج), *dhāl* (ذ), *shīn* (ش), *zā* (ز), *yā* (ي), *bā* (ب), *thā* (ث), *fā* (ف), *qāf* (ق) and *tā* (ت).[46] A total of twelve characters. Concentrating on only the first five inscriptions, which predate ʿUthmān's Muṣḥaf, we find that dots were standardized into the same pattern that is in usage today.

Muḥammad bin ʿUbaid bin Aus al-Gassānī, Muʿāwiya's secretary, states that Muʿāwiya asked him to carry out some *tarqīsh* (ترقيش) on a particular document. Inquiring what was meant by *tarqīsh*, he was told, "To give every character its due dots". Muʿāwiya added that he had done the same once for a document he had written on behalf of the Prophet.[47] Al-Gassānī is not well known in traditionist circles, and this weakens his narrative,[48] but we cannot discount this incident in light of the irrefutable facts proving the early use of dots.

ii. *The Invention of Diacritical Markings*

As mentioned earlier the diacritical marks, known in Arabic as *tashkīl* were invented by Abū al-Aswad ad-Du'alī (*d.* 69 A.H./688 C.E.). Ibn Abī Mulaika reports that during ʿUmar's reign, a Bedouin arrived seeking an instructor to help him learn the Qur'ān. Someone volunteered, but began committing such a string of mistakes while tutoring that ʿUmar had to stop him, correct him, then order that only those with adequate knowledge of Arabic should teach the Qur'ān. With such an incident no doubt clouding his mind, he requested Abū al-Aswad ad-Du'alī to compose a treatise on Arabic grammar.[49]

Ad-Du'alī took his assignment to heart, producing a treatise within which he devised four diacritical marks that could be posted on the concluding letter of each word. These took the form of colored dots (to differentiate them from skeletal dots, which were black); initially they consisted of a single color (red in the example below), with each dot's position signifying its specific mark. A lone dot placed after, on, or below the letter constituted a *ḍamma, fatḥa* or *kasra*, respectively. Similarly two dots placed after, on, or below the letter indicated *ḍamma tanween* (double *ḍamma*), *fatḥa tanween* or *kasra tanween*, respectively.[50] (This synopsis does little justice to his actual conventions, which were quite elaborate.) During Muʿāwiya's reign (*d.* 60 A.H./679 C.E.) he accepted a commission to apply this dotting system to a copy of the Muṣḥaf, a task probably completed *c.* 50 A.H./670 C.E.

Figure 10.12: Example of a Muṣḥaf written in the Kūfic script, bearing ad-Du'alī's dotting scheme. Courtesy of the National Archive Museum of Yemen.

---

[45] G.C. Miles, "Early Islamic Inscriptions Near Ṭā'if, in the Ḥijāz", *JNES*, vol. vii, no. 4 (Oct. 1948), pp. 236-42. From the outline of the text as provided by Miles, there are a total of seventeen letters in this inscription with dots. The inscription reads (translation): "[1] This dam [belongs] to servant of God Muʿāwiya [2] The Amīr of the believers. ʿAbdullāh bin Ṣakhr built it [3] with the permission of Allāh, in the year fifty eight. O [4] Allāh, pardon servant of God Muʿāwiya, A- [5] mīr of the believers, and strengthen him, and make him victorious, and grant the [6] believers the enjoyment of [the dam]. Written [by] ʿAmr bin Ḥabbāb". (After Miles, but with some modifications.)

[46] One of the inscriptions which was excluded from this list is a graffito next to the dated Kūfic inscription from Qāʿ al-Muʿtadil (see Figure 9.13). The graffito reads, "I am Zuhayr, client of the daughter of Shaibah", and it appends dots to the letters *nūn* (ن) and *zā* (ز). Part of the reason for not including it is that UNESCO, which added the original dated inscription to the Memory of the World Register of Documentary Collections, chose to exclude this graffito. So probably it is of later origin, though the name Zuhayr occurs in both writings.

[47] Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *al-Jāmiʿ*, i:269.

[48] Refer to the chapter on Muslim methodology for greater details (Chapter 13).

[49] Ad-Dānī, *al-Muḥkam*, pp. 4-5, footnote 2, quoting Ibn al-Anbārī, *al-Iḍāḥ*, pp. 15a-16a. An-Nadīm gives a detailed description of the manuscript of ad-Du'alī's treatise on grammar. He discovered it in Ibn Abī Baʿra's library, consisting of four folios and copied by the famous grammarian Yaḥyā bin Yaʿmar (*d.* 90 A.H./708 C.E.). It carried the signature of another grammarian, ʿAllān an-Naḥawī, and beneath it the signature of an-Naḍr bin Shumail. [an-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, p. 46.] These signatures established the legitimacy of Abū al-Aswad ad-Du'alī's original authorship of the treatise.

[50] Ad-Dānī, *al-Muḥkam*, pp. 6-7.

This scheme was transmitted from ad-Duʾalī to later generations through the efforts of Yaḥyā bin Yaʿmar (*d.* 90 A.H./708 C.E.), Naṣr bin ʿĀṣim al-Laithī (*d.* 100 A.H./718 C.E.), and Maimūn al-Aqran, arriving at Khalīl bin Aḥmad al-Frāheedī (*d.* 170 A.H./786 C.E.) who altered this pattern by replacing the colored dots with shapes that resembled certain characters.[51] Centuries lapsed, however, before al-Frāheedī's scheme finally superseded the earlier system.

Every center appears to have practiced a slightly different convention at first. Ibn Ushta reports that the Muṣḥaf of Ismāʿīl al-Qusṭ, the Imām of Makkah (100-170 A.H./718-786 C.E.), bore a dotting system dissimilar to the one used by the Iraqis,[52] while ad-Dānī notes that the scholars of Ṣanʿāʾ followed yet another framework.[53] Likewise, the pattern used by the Madīnites differed from the Baṣarites; by the close of the first century however, the Baṣarite conventions became ubiquitous to the extent that even the Madīnite scholars adopted them.[54] Later developments witnessed the introduction of multi-colored dots, each diacritical mark being assigned a unique color.

Figure 10.13: Example of a Muṣḥaf in the Kūfic script. The diacritical dots are multi-colored (red, green, yellow, and a pale shade of blue). Note also the āyah separators and the tenth āyah marker, as discussed in Chapter 8. Courtesy of the National Archive Museum of Yemen

---

[51] *ibid*, p. 7.
[52] *ibid*, p. 9.
[53] *ibid*, p. 235.
[54] *ibid*, p. 7.

iii. Parallel Usage of Two Different Diacritical Marking Schemes

Khalīl bin Aḥmad al-Frāheedī's diacritical scheme won rapid introduction into non-Qurʾānic texts, so for the sake of differentiation the script and diacritical marks reserved for masterly copies of the Qurʾān were deliberately kept different from those that were common to other books, though slowly some calligraphers began to use the new diacritical system in the Qurʾān as well.[55] I am fortunate to have a few color pictures of the Qurʾānic fragments from the Ṣanʿāʾ Collection, through which the development of such schemes can be demonstrated.

Figures 10.12 and 10.13 (above) probably date from the second century A.H., while the next is an example of the Qurʾānic script from the third century A.H.[56]

Figure 10.14: Example of Qurʾānic script from the third century A.H. Note again the multi-colored dots. Courtesy of the National Archive Museum of Yemen

The next figure is an example of non-Qurʾānic script from the same period; the difference is readily visible in the script and in the schemes employed for skeletal and diacritical markings. For further examples, see Figures 10.17 and 10.18.

---

[55] Among the earliest of those calligraphers are Ibn Muqla (*d.* 327 A.H.) and Ibn al-Bawwāb (*d.* circa 413 A.H.). In fact Ibn al-Bawwāb even shied away from ʿUthmān's orthography. The current trend is to fall back to the early orthography, *e.g.* the Muṣḥaf printed by the King Fahd Complex in Madinah (see p. 145.).

[56] Based on the description in the catalogue: *Maṣāḥif Ṣanʿāʾ*, Dar al-Athar al-Islam - yyah (Kuwait National Museum), 19 March – 19 May 1985, Plate no. 53. In this regard I have some reservations; for example, I believe that Figure 10.12 belongs to the late first century.

Figure 10.15: Example of a non-Qur'ānic script, end of the second century A.H. *Note the diacritical marks, in line with al-Frāheedī's scheme. Source: A. Shākir (ed.),* ar-Risālah of ash-Shāfiʿī, *Cairo, 1940, Plate 6.*

4. Sources of the Skeletal and Diacritical Dotting Systems

Father Yūsuf Saʿīd, cited by al-Munaggid as an authority on the history of alphabets, skeletal dotting systems and diacritical marks, contends that the Syriacs may have been the first to develop the dotting system.[57] The reference here is to skeletal dots, as seen in such characters as ح, ج, خ. His claim does not extend to the usage of diacritical markings. But Dr. ʿIzzat Ḥasan (ed.), in his introduction to *al-Muḥkam fī Naqṭil Maṣāḥif*, takes the extra step and attributes the diacritical system to Syriac influence: as the Syriacs were in the forefront of grammatical and dotting schemes, so the Arabs borrowed freely from them.[58] For this argument he quotes the Italian Orientalist Guidi, Archbishop Yūsuf Dāwūd, Isrāʾīl Wilfinson, and ʿAlī ʿAbdul-Wāḥid al-Wāfī – this last simply repeating previous commentators. Dr. Ibrāhīm Jumʿa has expressed the identical view of Arabs borrowing the diacritical system from the Syriac language, where he cites Wilfinson.[59] This is the conclusion of many others, including Rev. Mingana who (never one for sugar-coating his words) remarks,

> The first discoverer of the Arabic vowels is unknown to history. The opinions of Arab authors, on this point, are too worthless to be quoted.[60]

---

[57] S. al-Munaggid, *Etudes de Paleographie Arabe*, p. 128. Al-Munaggid shows some reservation about attributing the skeletal dots to Syriac influence.

[58] ʿIzzat Ḥasan (ed.), *al-Muḥkam fī Naqṭil Maṣāḥif*, pp. 28-29.

[59] Ibrāhīm Jumʿa, *Dirāsātun fī Taṭawwur al-Kitābāt al-Kūfiyya*, 1969, pp. 17, 27, 372.

[60] A. Mingana and A.S. Lewis (eds.), *Leaves from Three Ancient Qurâns Possibly Pre-*

Asserting that Syriac universities, schools, and monasteries established a system between 450-700 C.E., he says, "[the] foundation of the Arabic vowels is based on the vowels of the Aramaeans. The names given to these vowels is an irrefutable proof of the veracity of this assertion: such like Phath and Phataha".[61] According to him, Arabs did not elaborate this system till the latter half of the 8th century C.E.[62] through the influence of the Baghdādī school, which was under the direction of Nestorian scholars and where the celebrated Ḥunain had written his treatise on Syriac grammar.[63]

In the Syriac alphabet only two characters possess skeletal dots: dolath (dal) and rish (ra). By comparison the Arabic alphabet contains a total of sixteen dotted characters: ب, ت, ث, ج, خ, ذ, ز, ش, ض, ظ, غ, ف, ق, ن, ي and ة. Presuming that the Arabs borrowed their multitudinous dots from the Syriac becomes a difficult proposition; moreover we have clear pre-Islamic evidence of the usage of skeletal dots, hailing from the early 7th century and perhaps from as long ago as the 3rd century C.E.[64]

Now let us proceed to diacritical markings in Syriac, of which two sets exist. According to Yūsuf Dāwūd Iqlaimis, the Bishop of Damascus,

> It is confirmed without doubt that in the life of Jacob of Raha, who died in the beginning of the 8th century C.E. there did not appear any diacritical marking method in Syriac, neither the Greek vowels, nor the dotting system.[65]

According to Davidson though,[66] Jacob of Raha (*d.* 708 C.E.) invented the first set of markings in the seventh century, while Theophilus invented the second set (Greek vowels) in the eighth. Keeping in mind that the end of the seventh century C.E. corresponds to 81 A.H., and the end of the eighth to 184 A.H., the question becomes: who borrowed from whom? In light of what Davidson mentions the verdict could fall either way, so let us seek an answer by examining the scripts. The figure below illustrates some Syriac vowels.[67]

ʿOthmânic: with a list of their Variants, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1914, p. xxxi.

[61] *ibid*, p. xxx.

[62] This translates to 130 A.H. and onwards, because 700-799 C.E. = 81-184 A.H.

[63] Mingana and Lewis (eds.), op. cit., p. xxxi.

[64] Refer back to the Raqūsh inscription, Chapter 9.

[65] Yūsuf Dāwūd Iqlaimis Bishop of Damascus, *al-Lamʿa ash-Shahiyya fī Naḥw al-Lugha as-Siryāniyya*, 2nd edition, Moṣul, 1896, p. 169.

[66] B. Davidson, *Syriac Reading Lessons*, London, 1851.

[67] *Ibid.*

a read ah
e " ay
i " ee
o " oh
u " oo

Figure 10.16: Examples of Syriac vowels.

The signs used by Jacob of Raha bear significant resemblance to the Qurʾānic diacritical system. Now recall that the inventor of the Arabic system, Abū al-Aswad ad-Duʾalī, died in 69 A.H. (688 C.E.), and that he dotted the entire Muṣḥaf during Muʿāwiya's reign *c.* 50 A.H./670 C.E. Suddenly the issue of who borrowed from whom becomes crystal clear. For six hundred years the Syriacs wrote their Bibles without any diacritical markings, though they boasted a university in Nisibis and several colleges and monasteries, all in operation since 450 C.E. Yet their diacritical marks were not conceived until the late 7th/early 8th century, while ad-Duʾalī's dotted Muṣḥaf was finished in the third quarter of the 7th century C.E. Logic clearly dictates that Jacob copied the system from the Muslims. This is if we accept Davidson's claim; if we accept the verdict of the Bishop of Damascus however, then there is no need for even this argument.

As regards Rev. Mingana's allegation that the Arabs failed to elaborate this system till the latter half of the eighth century C.E., consider the following:

1. There is a report that Ibn Sīrīn (*d.* 110 A.H./728 C.E.) possessed a Muṣḥaf originally dotted by Yaḥyā bin Yaʿmar (*d.* 90 A.H./708 C.E.).[68]
2. Khālid al-Ḥadhdhāʾ used to follow the recitations of Ibn Sīrīn from a dotted Muṣḥaf.[69]

Both incidents are much earlier than the proposed borrowing scheme.

Syriac grammar gained its identity through the efforts of Ḥunain bin Isḥāq (194-260 A.H./810-873 C.E.);[70] contrary to Mingana's beliefs, Ḥunain's treatise on Syriac had no influence on Arabic grammar whatsoever because Sībawaih (*d.* 180 A.H./796 C.E.),[71] the greatest Arabic grammarian, died before Ḥunain was even born. Ḥunain himself was in fact a product of the Islamic civilization. He learned Arabic in Baṣra, from a pupil of one of the students of the famous Muslim lexicographer Khalīl bin Aḥmad al-Frāheedī (100-170 A.H./718-786 C.E.).[72]

5. Orthographic and Paleographic 'Irregularities' in Early Non-Qurʾānic Script

Earlier we discussed how two different diacritical schemes were employed in parallel, one for the Qurʾān and another for all other works. We also noted the difference in the Qurʾānic and non-Qurʾānic scripts, and the scholars' legal opinion against modernizing the spelling conventions found in ʿUthmān's Muṣḥaf. But what about the other books, how did they evolve in response to changes in the paleography and orthography of the Arabic script?

Figure 10.17: An example of non-Qurʾānic script dated 227 A.H. Source: R.G. Khoury, Wahb b. Munabbih, *Plate PB 9. Reprinted with the publisher's kind permission.*

Figure 10.17 is a sample half page from *Maghāzī Wahb bin Munabbih*, from a manuscript dated 227 A.H. Khoury provides a fine list of peculiar

---

[68] Ad-Dānī, *al-Naqṭ*, p. 129.

[69] Ad-Dānī, *al-Muḥkam*, p. 13.

[70] Ḥunain b. Isḥāq (194-260 A.H./810-873 C.E.): born at Ḥīra in a Christian (Syriac-speaking) family. "On account of his attitude to iconoclasm he was suspected of blasphemy and excommunicated by Bishop Theodosius ..." [J. Ruska, "Ḥunain b. Isḥāk", *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, First edition, E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1927, p. 336].

[71] Sībawaih (*c.* 135-180 A.H./752-796 C.E.): one of the greatest authorities on Arabic grammar, and the author of that famous tome, *al-Kitāb*. [See Kaḥḥāla, *Muʿjam al-Muwʾallifīn*, ii:584.]

[72] Kaḥḥāla, op. cit., i:662.

spellings that he encountered in this text,[73] a sample of which I have reproduced below:

Wahb MS	Modern spelling	*Wahb MS*	Modern spelling	*Wahb MS*	Modern spelling
اعدى	أعداء	سفها	سفهاء	المرة	المرأة
نساكم	نساءكم	هولى	هولاء	جاك	جاءك
اقرى	اقرأ	اوحا	أوحى	تلى	تلا
ظحا	ضحى	ظلت	ضلت	البلى	البلاء

Among the more interesting oddities are the word لئن spelled as لن (*i.e.* without the *hamza*), and قرأ spelled as قرى without any dots.

Figure 10.18: Another example of non-Qur'ānic script, dated 252 A.H. Source: Leiden University Library, manuscript no. Or. 298, f. 239b. Reproduced with their kind permission.

Figure 10.18 is a sample part page from Abū 'Ubaid's *Gharīb al-Ḥadīth* preserved at Leiden University Library. This manuscript is flooded with 'irregularities' in the skeletal dotting system.[74] The letter *qāf* (ق): void of

---

[73] Raif G. Khoury, *Wahb b. Munabbih*, Otto Harrassowitz – Wiesbaden, 1972, Teil 1, pp. 22-27.

[74] This list is not exhaustive and is based on the portion shown. De Goeje has studied this manuscript in detail and observed further irregularities [M.J. de Goeje, "Beschreibung einer alten Handschrift von Abū 'Obaida's Garīb-al-ḥadīt", *ZDMG*, xviii:781-807 as quoted in *Levinus Warner and His Legacy (Catalogue of the commemorative exhibition held in the Bibliotheca Thysiana from April 27th till May 15th 1970)*, E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1970, pp. 75-76]. I thank Prof. J.J. Witkam for this refer-

dots (red arrow: lines 1, 2 and 4); with a single dot underneath (green arrow: lines 3 and 4); with two dots above the character (blue arrow: last line). The isolated *ya'* (ي):[75] void of dots (light blue arrow: line 3); as before but in a different form (violet arrow: last line); with two dots underneath (yellow arrow: line 8).

The interesting point is that all these 'irregularities' take place within a single page. Surely a single copyist was involved, but his decision to script these letters in multiple styles suggests that all were equally valid, and reinforces what we discussed earlier regarding the numerous permissible forms given to the three vowels: ا, و, ي. 'Irregularity' itself exists only in our judgment since, if both styles were permissible at the time, we cannot in good conscience label the scribe as inconsistent. Whatever reason we conjure up for the liberal paleography of that era is actually unimportant. Islamic methodology dictates that every student must learn directly from a teacher and is never entitled to study any text on his own; so long as this oral tradition remained, and the teacher was able to decipher the irregularities in his own handwriting, there was no risk of corruption.

Hundreds of excellent references are devoted to the spelling and dotting schemes used in Muṣḥafs, and for further reading I suggest (1) *Kitāb an-Naqṭ* by Abū 'Amr ad-Dānī (371-444 A.H.), published by al-Azhar University, Cairo; and (2) *Al-Muḥkam fī Naqṭ al-Maṣāḥif* by ad-Dānī, edited by Dr. 'Izzat Ḥasan, Damascus, 1379/1960.

Interested readers should also consult the introduction to *al-Badī' fī Rasm Maṣāḥif 'Uthmān* (pages 43-54), edited by al-Funaisān, where he cites eighty works on this topic. The main purpose of these works is to educate the reader on the 'Uthmāni conventions, and not to suggest that they were in any way flawed or underdeveloped. We have already observed the discrepancies between 17th century written English and that of modern times, and if we view these changes as an evolutionary process (instead of proclaiming one or the other as defective) then that is surely the attitude we must extend to Arabic.

6. Conclusion

Skeletal dots (known to Arabs prior to Islam) and diacritical marks (a Muslim invention) were both absent from 'Uthmān's endeavors to independently compile the Qur'ān. By its consonant-heavy and dotless nature, it was

---

ence and the color image.

[75] In scripting the isolated *ya'* two different skeleton forms are used (see for example the blue and violet arrows).

uniquely shielded from the guiles of anyone attempting to bypass oral scholarship and learn the Qur'ān on his own; such a person would be readily detected if he ever dared to recite in public. In his reluctance to incorporate extraneous material into the Muṣḥaf, 'Uthmān was not alone: Ibn Mas'ūd was of a similar mind. At a later date Ibrāhīm an-Nakha'ī (*d.* 96 A.H.), once noticing a Muṣḥaf with added headings such as "The Beginning of [such-and-such] *Sūra*", found it distasteful and ordered that they be erased.[76] Yaḥyā bin Abī Kathīr (*d.* 132 A.H.) notes,

> Dots were the first thing incorporated by Muslims into the Muṣḥaf, an act which they said brought light to the text [*i.e.* clarified it]. Subsequently they added dots at the end of each verse to separate it from the next, and after that, information showing the beginning and end of each sūra.[77]

Recently I came across a harsh comment on Qur'ānic orthography, by an Arab writer insisting that we follow the modern Arabic layout and discard the conventions of those who scripted the 'Uthmāni Muṣḥaf as the folly of illiterates. I wholly disagree. It is sheer folly, on the part of this person and such giants as Ibn Khaldūn, to forget the inevitable evolution of language over time; do they believe that, after the passing of a few centuries, others would not step forward to denounce *their* efforts as the work of illiterates? A Book that has resisted any universal alterations for fourteen centuries is living proof that the text within belongs to Allāh, Who has appointed Himself as Guardian. The inviolability of the original, immaculately preserved for so long, is not to be suffered the tampering and adjustments meted out to the biblical Scriptures.[78]

---

[76] Ad-Dānī, *al-Muḥkam*, p. 16.

[77] See Ibn Kathīr, *Faḍā'il*, vii:467.

[78] See Chapters 16 and 18.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

STUDIES OF EXISTING MUṢḤAFS ASCRIBED TO 'UTHMĀN

As mentioned earlier, once Caliph 'Uthmān endorsed the Muṣḥafs official copies were dispatched to different regions of the Muslim world. The most favored opinion is six copies: Madinah, Makkah, Kūfa, Baṣra and Syria (Shām) in addition to the one which 'Uthmān kept for himself.[1]

Almost concurrently 'Uthmān's contemporaries quickly began scrutinizing these Muṣḥafs, trekking to the various locales which had received copies and undertaking a word-by-word (in fact a letter-by-letter) inspection, to uncover any disparities between the copies he had sent forth. In this chapter we will cover the differences between the officially prepared Muṣḥafs, a private copy by a noted Companion, two of the most ancient extant Muṣḥafs in the Hejāzī script, and finally five Muṣḥafs that have been traditionally linked to the third caliph, scattered across half the globe.

1. Differences Among 'Uthmān's Six Official Muṣḥafs

Many scholars expended their time and fatigue in comparing 'Uthmān's Muṣḥafs, reporting what they found with sincerity and attempting to hide nothing. Abū ad-Dardā' (d. *c.* 35 A.H.),[2] a noted Companion, worked extensively on this subject before passing away within a decade of their dispatchment, leaving his widow to transmit his findings.[3] Khālid b. Iyās b. Ṣakhr b. Abī al-Jahm, in examining the Muṣḥaf in 'Uthmān's personal possession (Muṣḥaf al-Imām), noticed that this particular copy differed from the Muṣḥaf of Madinah in twelve instances.[4] Overall, their findings, when taken together, are startling. All differences in the Muṣḥafs of Makkah, Madinah, Kūfa, Baṣra, Syria, and ʿUthmān's master copy involve single letters, such as: ا, ف, و, … *etc.*, the only exception being the exclusion of هو ('he') in a verse and من ('from') in another where the meaning is in no way affected. These skeletal variations amount to slightly over forty characters scattered throughout six Muṣḥafs, as listed below.[5] For the sake of comparison we have appended the King Fahd Complex Muṣḥaf as an example of a present day Muṣḥaf.[6] The entries are color coded such that all entries exhibiting the same consonantal text, along a single row, share the same color.

---

[1] Refer back to p. 102.

[2] There is some disagreement as to the year he died. It was either towards the end of 'Uthmān's reign or slightly afterwards [Ibn Ḥajar, *Taqrīb at-Tahzīb*, entry nr. 5228].

[3] See Abū 'Ubaid, *Faḍā'il*, p. 330.

[4] The fact is that the Muṣḥaf of Madinah was lost (or destroyed) during the civil strife (*fitna*) which ensued the day 'Uthmān was assassinated. [Ibn Shabba, *Tārīkh al-Madīnah*, pp. 7-8.] How then were various scholars able to examine the Muṣḥaf reserved for Madinah? The answer is two-fold. Firstly, Abū ad-Dardā', a highly renowned Companion who died the same year as 'Uthmān, carried out extensive studies on the Muṣḥafs dispatched by 'Uthmān including the one kept in Madinah. His findings, tabulated before the Muṣḥaf of Madinah had disappeared, served as a

	Sūra:verse	Madinah	Makkah	Kūfa	Baṣra	Shām	Muṣḥaf al-Imām	King Fahd
1	2:116	وقالوا اتخذ	وقالوا اتخذ	وقالوا اتخذ	وقالوا اتخذ	قالوا اتخذ	وقالوا اتخذ	وقالوا اتخذ
2	2:132	واوصى	ووصى	ووصى	ووصى	واوصى	ووصى	ووصى
3	3:133	سارعوا	وسارعوا	وسارعوا	وسارعوا	سارعوا	وسارعوا	وسارعوا
4	3:184	والزبر والكتب	والزبر والكتب	والزبر والكتب	والزبر والكتب	وبالزبر والكتب	والزبر والكتب	والزبر والكتاب
5	4:66	الا قليل	الا قليل	الا قليل	الا قليل	الا قليلا	الا قليل	الا قليل
6	5:53	يقول الذين	يقول الذين	ويقول الذين	ويقول الذين	يقول الذين	ويقول الذين	ويقول الذين
7	5:54	من يرتدد	من يرتد	من يرتد	من يرتد	من يرتدد	من يرتد	من يرتد
8	6:32	وللدار	وللدار	وللدار	وللدار	ولدار	وللدار	وللدار
9	6:63	لئن انجيتنا	لئن انجيتنا	لئن انجينا	لئن انجيتنا	لئن انجيتنا	لئن انجيتنا	لئن انجىٰنا
10	6:137	شركاوهم	شركاوهم	شركاوهم	شركاوهم	شركائهم	شركاوهم	شركاؤهم
11	7:3	تذكرون	تذكرون	تذكرون	تذكرون	يتذكرون	تذكرون	تذكرون
12	7:43	وما كنا لنهتدى	وما كنا لنهتدى	وما كنا لنهتدى	وما كنا لنهتدى	ما كنا لنهتدى	وما كنا لنهتدى	وما كنا لنهتدى
13	7:75	قال الملا	قال الملا	قال الملا	قال الملا	وقال الملا	قال الملا	قل الملأ
14	7:141	واذ انجينكم	واذ انجينكم	واذ انجينكم	واذ انجينكم	واذ انجاكم	واذ انجينكم	واذ انجينكم
15	9:100	تجرى تحتها	تجرى من تحتها	تجرى تحتها	تجرى تحتها	تجرى تحتها	تجرى تحتها	تجرى تحتها
16	9:107	الذين اتخذوا	والذين اتخذوا	والذين اتخذوا	والذين اتخذوا	الذين اتخذوا	والذين اتخذوا	والذين اتخذوا
17	10:22	يسيركم	يسيركم	يسيركم	يسيركم	ينشركم	يسيركم	يسيركم
18	17:93	قل سبحان	قال سبحان	قل سبحان	قل سبحان	قال سبحان	قل سبحان	قل سبحان
19	18:36	خيرا منهما	خيرا منهما	خيرا منها	خيرا منها	خيرا منهما	خيرا منها	خيرا منها
20	18:95	ما مكنى	ما مكننى	ما مكنى	ما مكنى	ما مكنى	ما مكتى	ما مكنى
21	21:4	قل ربى	قل ربى	قال ربى	قل ربى	قل ربى	قل ربى	قال ربى
22	21:30	اولم ير الذين	الم ير الذين	اولم ير الذين	اولم ير الذين	اولم ير الذين	اولم ير الذين	اولم ير الذين
23	23:87	سيقولون لله	سيقولون لله	سيقولون لله	سيقولون الله	سيقولون لله	سيقولون لله	سيقولون لله
24	23:89	سيقولون لله	سيقولون لله	سيقولون لله	سيقولون الله	سيقولون لله	سيقولون لله	سيقولون لله
25	23:112	قال كم لبثتم	قال كم لبثتم	قل كم لبثتم	قال كم لبثتم	قال كم لبثتم	قال كم لبثتم	قل كم لبثتم
26	23:114	قال ان لبثتم	قال ان لبثتم	قل ان لبثتم	قال ان لبثتم	قال ان لبثتم	قال ان لبثتم	قل ان لبثتم
27	25:25	ونزل الملئكة	وننزل الملئكة	ونزل الملئكة	ونزل الملئكة	ونزل الملئكة	ونزل الملئكة	ونزل الملـٰئكة
28	26:217	فتوكل	وتوكل	وتوكل	وتوكل	فتوكل	وتوكل	وتوكل
29	27:21	لياتينى	لياتيننى	لياتينى	لياتينى	لياتينى	لياتينى	ليأتينى
30	28:37	وقال موسى	قال موسى	وقال موسى	وقال موسى	وقال موسى	وقال موسى	وقال موسى
31	36:35	وما عملته	وما عملته	وما عملت	وما عملته	وما عملته	وما عملته	وما عملته
32	39:64	تامرونى	تامرونى	تامرونى	تامرونى	تامروننى	تامرونى	تأمرونى
33	40:21	اشد منهم	اشد منهم	اشد منهم	اشد منهم	اشد منكم	اشد منهم	اشد منهم
34	40:26	وان يظهر	وان يظهر	او ان يظهر	وان يظهر	وان يظهر	او ان يظهر	او ان يظهر
35	42:30	بما كسبت	فبما كسبت	فبما كسبت	فبما كسبت	بما كسبت	فبما كسبت	فبما كسبت
36	43:68	يعبادى	يعباد	يعباد	يعباد	يعبادى	يعبادى	يعباد
37	43:71	ما تشتهيه	ما تشتهى	ما تشتهى	ما تشتهى	ما تشتهيه	ما تشتهيه	ما تشتهيه
38	46:15	حسنا	حسنا	احسنا	حسنا	حسنا	حسنا	احسنا
39	47:18	ان تاتيهم	ان تاتهم	ان تاتهم	ان تاتيهم	ان تاتيهم	ان تاتيهم	ان تاتيهم
40	55:12	ذو العصف	ذو العصف	ذو العصف	ذو العصف	ذا العصف	ذو العصف	ذو العصف
41	55:78	ذى الجلل	ذى الجلل	ذى الجلل	ذى الجلل	ذو الجلل	ذى الجلل	ذى الجلل
42	57:10	وكلا وعد الله	وكلا وعد الله	وكلا وعد الله	وكلا وعد الله	وكل وعد الله	وكلا وعد الله	وكلا وعد الله
43	57:24	الغنى	هو الغنى	هو الغنى	هو الغنى	الغنى	هو الغنى	هو الغنى
44	91:15	فلا يخاف	ولا يخاف	ولا يخاف	ولا يخاف	فلا يخاف	ولا يخاف	ولا يخاف

Clearly, the six ʿUthmānic Muṣḥafs are by and large congruent with each other. The minor deviations among them can be summed up as follows: (1) an extra ا in 11 places; (2) an extra و in 8 places; (3) an extra character (other than *alif* or *wāw*) in 16 places; (4) a character in place of another in 6 places; (5) an extra من in a single place; (6) an extra هو in

---

template for subsequent scholars [see for example Abū ʿUbaid, *Faḍā'il*. pp. 330-32]. Secondly (and perhaps more importantly), the scholars who could no longer analyze the Muṣḥaf of Madinah *per se* often state in their writings that they examined "the Muṣḥafs of the people of Ḥejāz [western Arabia]". Meaning, that what they examined were authenticated duplicates of the Muṣḥaf of Madinah, made by well-known Companions or scholars for their own personal use prior to the Muṣḥaf's disappearance (see the note at the end of pp. 171 - 72.). In this way they were able to sidestep the actual Muṣḥaf's loss, and carry out detailed analysis of its text anyway.

[5] See Abū ʿUbaid, *Faḍā'il*, pp. 328-33; also ad-Dānī, *al-Muqniʿ*, pp. 112-14.

[6] Based on the narrative of Ḥafṣ from ʿĀṣim, one of the seven unanimously accepted authoritative recitations of the Qur'ān.

one place. Totaling a mere forty-five letters in 9000 lines,[7] these variations are inconsequential to the meaning of each verse and bear no alteration to the semantics whatsoever. But they cannot be attributed to carelessness. While preparing the master copies Zaid bin Thābit; in each case finding both readings to be authentic and of equal status, retained them in different Muṣḥafs.[8] The inclusion of both side by side would only have wrought confusion; alternatively, placing one of them in the margin would imply a lesser degree of authenticity. By placing them in different copies he accommodated them on equal terms.

The modern approach to textual criticism requires that, when variations arise between two manuscripts of equal status, the editor cites one of the two in the core text while the deviations are consigned to footnotes. This method is unjust however, as it demotes the value of the second variant. Zaid's scheme is much the fairer; by preparing multiple copies he sidesteps any implications that this or that reading is superior, giving each variant its just due.[9]

A final word of clarification: these early scholars based their studies *only* on the official copies of the Muṣḥaf, as sent by ʿUthmān himself, or on duplicate copies made and kept by well-known Companions and Qurʾānic scholars. Theirs was not a research into the private copies kept by the public at large (which must have numbered in the thousands), because the official Muṣḥafs were the standard and not the other way around. Let us however take a look at one of these.

2. Studies on the Muṣḥaf of Mālik bin Abī ʿĀmir al-Aṣbaḥī

Here we delve into a comparison between ʿUthmān's Muṣḥaf and another, a personal copy kept by a well-known scholar. Mālik bin Anas (94-179 A.H./712-795 C.E.) once handed this Muṣḥaf to his students[10] and recounted

---

[7] Actually 8,832 lines. The Muṣḥaf printed by the King Fahd Complex in Madinah has 604 pages with 15 lines per page. Sūra separators take out 2 lines each.

[8] Abū ʿUbaid, *Faḍāʾil*, p. 333; see also ad-Dānī, *al-Muqniʿ*, pp. 118-19.

[9] This is also the methodology of the early *muḥaddithīn*. In comparing different copies of the same *ḥadīth* manuscript, they either mention one copy's text without reference to variations, or cite all the variations inside the core text itself instead of placing notes in the margins. In the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of Muslim for instance, the *ḥadīth* on ṣalāt no. 245 indicates only Ibn Numair's narration; three *ḥadīths* earlier (ṣalāt no. 242), he provides a full account of the different narrations while keeping them inside the core text.

[10] These included Ibn al-Qāsim, Ashhab, Ibn Wahb, Ibn ʿAbdul-Ḥakam, and others.

its history: it belonged to his grandfather, Mālik bin Abī ʿĀmir al-Aṣbaḥī (*d.* 74 A.H./693 C.E.), a student of Caliph ʿUmar,[11] and one of the twelve whom ʿUthmān assembled to oversee the task of collecting the Qurʾān.[12] He had written it down during ʿUthmān's preparation of the Muṣḥafs.[13] Mālik bin Anas' students quickly noted some of its features:

- It was decorated with silver.
- It contained sūra separators in black ink along an ornamental band, like a chain running along the entire line.
- It had āyah (verse) separators in the form of a dot.[14]

Intrigued by this find the students compared Mālik's Muṣḥaf on the one hand, and the Muṣḥafs of Madinah, Kūfa, Baṣra, and ʿUthmān's master copy on the other. Mālik's Muṣḥaf agreed with the Muṣḥaf of Madinah in all but four places.[15] These are summarized below:

	Sūra: verse	Muṣḥaf of Madinah	Mālik's Muṣḥaf
1	42:30	بما كسبت	فبما كسبت
2	43:71	ما تشتهيه	ما تشتهى
3	57:24	الغنى	هو الغنى
4	91:15	فلا يخاف	ولا يخاف

From this chart we note that Mālik's Muṣḥaf remains identical to the Muṣḥaf of Madinah until sūra 41; from sūra 44 onwards, his Muṣḥaf is in perfect harmony with the Muṣḥaf of Baṣra. While acting as one of the twelve who scribed ʿUthmān's Muṣḥaf, Mālik was simultaneously writing this Muṣḥaf for his own personal use. Judging from the above list we can infer that he was first put to work with the group that eventually prepared the Muṣḥaf of Madinah. Having finished five-sixth of that Muṣḥaf, he then switched to the group which was preparing the Muṣḥaf of Baṣra; thus the final one-sixth tallies with the latter. For sūras 42 and 43, Mālik appears to have switched back and forth between the two groups.

---

[11] Ibn Ḥajar, *Taqrīb at-Tahzīb*, p. 517, entry no. 6443.

[12] Ibn Ḥajar, *Fatḥul Bārī*, ix:19. See also p. 97.

[13] Ad-Dānī, *al-Muḥkam*, p. 17.

[14] Examples of sūra and āyāh separators from numerous Muṣḥafs are provided in Chapter 8. As an aside, I came across this statement by Grohmann: "I have suggested, as far as sūra separators are concerned, they were taken over from Greek or Syriac manuscripts, in which they marked the beginning ..." [A. Grohmann, "The Problem of Dating Early Qurʾāns", *Der Islam*, Band 33, Heft 3, pp. 228-29]. It is both aggravating and amusing how determined Orientalists are to credit other cultures with seemingly every minute Muslim achievement—even something as simple as separating one verse from the next with a dot.

[15] Ad-Dānī, in his book *al-Muqniʿ* [p. 116] mentions the four discrepancies between the Muṣḥafs of Mālik and Madinah, continuing that "the rest of Mālik's Muṣḥaf is according to the Muṣḥaf of Madinah as described by Ismāʿīl bin Jaʿfar al-Madanī".

This provides us with a measure of insight into the preparation of the official copies: it was a team effort where some dictated, and others wrote. The more exciting point, in my opinion, is the initiative and resourcefulness of individuals who penned their own copies. We do not know the precise number of these private copies but a statement by Ibn Shabba suggests that 'Uthmān personally encouraged this practice.[16] The Muṣḥaf of Mālik bin Abī 'Āmir al-Aṣbaḥī contained both āyah and sūra separators, while 'Uthmān's official copies contained neither. This lack may have been a deliberate tactic on the caliph's part, perhaps to ensure that the text could handle more than one arrangement of verse separation, or as an added obstacle in the face of anyone attempting to read on his own without the supervision of a certified teacher. Many scholars assume that any old Muṣḥaf bearing āyah and sūra separators must have been written subsequent to 'Uthmān's Muṣḥaf, but given this example we can see that that is not necessarily true.

3. Existing Muṣḥafs which are Ascribed to Caliph 'Uthmān

The official copies which 'Uthmān dispatched to the provincial centers are long lost. At present a few copies of the Qur'ān do exist that are popularly attributed to the third caliph, each bearing the appellation of 'Muṣḥaf 'Uthmān'. There is disagreement among scholars however as to whether they are truly 'Uthmānic. One of these, an almost complete copy that is missing only a couple of folios, is preserved at the Topkapi Sarayi Museum; a second is kept at the Türk ve Islâm Eserleri Müzesi Museum. Both are in Istanbul. A third lies in Tashkent, Uzbekistan. A fourth copy is preserved at al-Mashhad al-Ḥusainī Mosque in Cairo and the fifth is in the Institute of Oriental Studies, St. Petersburg.[17] Here we will assess each of these celebrated Muṣḥafs including a detailed study of their orthography. We begin with the Muṣḥaf of 'Uthmān in Tashkent as it is the most famous and the most studied.

---

[16] Ibn Shabba, *Tārīkh al-Madīna*, p. 1002.

[17] According to Prof. Hamidullah, there exists a Muṣḥaf at the India Office Library in London that is also ascribed to Caliph 'Uthmān.

i. *The Copy in Tashkent*

Also known as Muṣḥaf Samarqand. According to Prof. Hamidullah[18] the Muṣḥaf was originally housed in Damascus; it caught the eye of Tamerlane after he sacked the city and was removed to Samarqand, where it was kept in the Ak Medrese next to the Khwāja Aḥrār as-Samarqandī Masjid. In 1868 the Russians overran Samarqand and moved the Muṣḥaf to the Imperial Public Library in St. Petersburg, where it remained for nearly fifty years. With the Bolshevik advance at the end of the First World War, General Ali Akbar Topchi Bashi, who did not savor the thought of living under Communist rule, decided to safeguard the precious Muṣḥaf before fleeing to Paris. He dispatched a commando force to seize control of the royal palace and seek out the Muṣḥaf from the royal library. He then hurried to the railway station and, given his rank as an army general, demanded an engine from the station master. Placing the Qur'ān in the engine compartment with an army escort, he ordered the engine driver to push onwards to Turkistan as quickly as possible. A few hours later the Communist army commanders received intelligence of what had happened. They sent another engine with an escort to chase the one carrying the Muṣḥaf, but failed to catch up with it. In this way the manuscript reached Tashkent and the Communist authorities chose not to clamor for its return. It was stored in the Museum of History until 1989, when it was handed to the Muslim Board of Uzbekistan.

Following an 1891 article by A. Shebunin,[19] a Russian Orientalist who gave a detailed account of the Muṣḥaf, Orientalist interest in the Muṣḥaf became so pronounced that S. Pissareff opted to publish a facsimile edition.[20] Before doing so he took the very ill-advised step of retracing with fresh ink those folios which had faded over time, and in the process introduced many alterations into the text. Jeffery claimed that "while some mistakes due to ignorance have been made here and there in the process of re-inking, there are no adequate grounds for [any] charge of deliberate alteration".[21]

---

[18] M. Hamidullah, *Khuṭābāt Bhawalpur*, Islamic Research Institute, Islamabad, 1992, pp. 25-26.

[19] A. Shebunin, "Kuficheskiy Koran Imperatorskoy Sankt-Peterburgskoy Public - noy Biblioteki", *Zapiski Vostochnogo Otdeleniia Imperatosrkogo Russkogo Arkheologicheskogo Obshchestva*, St. Petersburg, 1892, vi:69-133.

[20] S. Pissareff, *Coran Coufique de Samarcand: écrit d'après la tradition de la propre main du troisième calife Osman (644-656), qui se trouve dans la Bibliothèque Impériale Publique de St. Pétersbourg*, St. Petersberg, 1905. Only fifty copies of this full-size facsimile seem to have been made, of which only twenty-five were sold for 500 rubles each.

[21] A. Jeffery and I. Mendelsohn, "The Orthography of the Samarqand Qur'ān Codex", *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. 62, no. 3 (Sep. 1942), p. 176.

Whatever Pissareff's intentions, the text has been corrupted and any attempt to trumpet the differences that now exist between this Muṣḥaf and others, as is the wont of certain internet sites, is beneath contempt.

Figure 11.1: A folio from the Tashkent Muṣḥaf, taken from Christie's 1993 auction.

The Muṣḥaf itself is large but incomplete, written on vellum in Kūfic script without pointing or diacritics, though verse endings are marked by small panels of diagonal lines. Each folio is sized 68×53 cm, the text block itself is 55×44 cm. Based on Pissareff's facsimile edition of 353 folios with 12 lines per page, it is estimated that the full copy of the Muṣḥaf must have comprised about 950 folios.[22] Shebunin dated the Muṣḥaf to the late first/early second century A.H.; based on the orthography of the 1905 facsimile edition, Jeffery dated it to the early ninth century C.E. (corresponding to the late second/early third century A.H.). Déroche assigned it to the second half of the eighth century C.E. (*c.* 135-180 A.H.).[23] Carbon-dating of a folio from this Muṣḥaf was carried out at Oxford. The result showed a 68% probability of a date between 640-765 C.E./19-148 A.H., and a 95% probability of a date between 595-855 C.E./27 B.H. - 241 A.H.[24] The results of carbon-dating are usually reported in the form of year ± *standard deviation*, followed by a confidence level. If the deviation is large the experiment becomes meaningless. In their 1989 paper "Radiocarbon Dating of the Shroud of Turin", the largest deviation listed was 32 for the 90% confidence level.[25] For this Muṣḥaf the given value of 725±130 C.E. (for the 95% assurance level) does not inspire confidence in the experiment.[26] Radiocarbon dating can only supplement the 'traditional' paleography and is rarely used in dating.

Apart from mistakes introduced by Pissareff, there are some errors within the Muṣḥaf which could only have stemmed from the original scribe himself. T. Altikulaç, in his detailed study of the Tashkent Muṣḥaf,[27] provides a sampling of these scribal errors: (a) in Q 3:37,[28] «إن الله» is missing from the verse «إن الله يرزق من يشاء بغير حساب»; (b) in Q 3:51, «هذا» is missing from the verse «هذا صراط مستقيم»; (c) in Q 3:78, «وما هو من عند الله» is missing from the verse «ويقولون هو من عند الله وما هو من عند الله»;[29] and (d) in Q 6:116, «هم» is missing from the verse «وإن هم إلا يخرصون».[30] Moreover the Muṣḥaf lacks consistency in its spelling, as the words شى, حتى and على are occasionally spelled شاى, حتا,

---

[22] T. Altikulaç, *Al-Muṣḥaf Al-Sharīf Attributed to ʿUthmān bin ʿAffān (The copy at the Topkapi Palace Museum)*, Research Center for Islamic History, Art and Culture (IRCICA), Istanbul, 2007, p. 67 (English Introduction). Some of the folios have recently turned up in auctions by Christie's and Sam Fogg. A folio from this Muṣḥaf was sold by Sotheby's in 2008 ["Arts of the Islamic World", *Sotheby's*, London, 9 Apr 2008, Sale L08220, Lot 1]. It is possible that some of these came from folios which were torn by visitors, one by one, prior to the Muṣḥaf's relocation to St. Petersburg in 1869 [Altikulaç, op. cit., p. 68].

[23] See Jeffery and Mendelsohn, op. cit., p. 195; see also F. Déroche, "Note sur les fragments coraniques anciens de Katta Langar (Ouzbékistan)", *Cahiers d'Asie Centrale*, 1999, vii:65.

[24] See F. Déroche, "Manuscripts of the Qur'ān", in J.D. McAuliffe (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of the Qur'ān*, Brill, Leiden, 2003, iii:261.

[25] P.E. Damon *et al*, "Radiocarbon Dating of the Shroud of Turin", *Nature*, vol. 337 (Feb. 1989), pp. 611-15, Table 2. The original 1988 radiocarbon dating by three independent teams of 21 scientists concluded that the shroud was only from the Middle Ages and not from the time of Jesus, with a dating 1260 – 1390 C.E. Ever since the announcement the authenticity of these tests has been challenged. Following accusations from both sides, C. Ramsey, head of the Oxford Radiocarbon Accelerator Unit agreed to a further test that may revise the initial dating ["Shroud of Turin stirs new controversy", *Los Angeles Times*, 17 Aug 2008].

[26] Much depends on who is doing what and there are ways to introduce bias. The results of the 1995 radiocarbon dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls were described as "too gross and iffy to settle any arguments". See H. Shanks, "New Carbon-14 Tests Leave Room for Debate", *Biblical Archaeology Review*, vol. 21, no. 4 (Jul/Aug 1995), p. 61.

[27] Altikulaç, op. cit., pp. 65-72 (English Introduction). An earlier study of the orthography of the Samarqand/Tashkent Muṣḥaf is found in Jeffery and Mendelsohn, op. cit., pp. 175-95.

[28] In this chapter the abbreviation 'Q' is used for Qur'ān.

[29] This is a textbook example of what is termed 'haplography' where the scribe, having penned ويقولون هو من عند الله, glanced back to his template and missed وما هو من عند الله, thinking it was the phrase he had just written as the last four words are identical.

[30] Altikulaç, op. cit., p. 67.

and علا.[31] The normal procedure for ʿUthmān's master copies was that they were carefully transcribed, carefully scrutinized by a scholar of reading, then fully revised to redress any errors prior to being sent forth. As the Tashkent Muṣḥaf clearly did not undergo this process, Altikulaç opines that it cannot be one of the official Muṣḥafs dispatched by Caliph ʿUthmān.[32] He does conclude though that it might have been copied from the official Muṣḥaf of Kūfa or from a copy based on it.[33]

ii. The Copy at Topkapi Sarayi

A note at the beginning of this Muṣḥaf states that the governor of Cairo, Muḥammad ʿAlī Pasha, sent it as a gift to the Ottoman Sultan Maḥmud II in 1226 A.H./1811 C.E. with the proposal that it be kept in the 'Pavilion of the Holy Mantle' at the Topkapi Sarayi Museum. It is currently preserved there as item no. 44/32.[34] Recently a facsimile edition of this Muṣḥaf was printed in Turkey.[35]

Figure 11.2: A folio from the 'Muṣḥaf ʿUthmān' at Topkapi Sarayi Museum, Istanbul.

---

[31] *ibid*, p. 71.

[32] *ibid*, p. 67.

[33] *ibid*, p. 70.

[34] *Ibid*, pp. 72-73.

[35] T. Altikulaç, *Al-Muṣḥaf Al-Sharif Attributed to ʿUthmān bin ʿAffān (The copy at the Topkapi Palace Museum)*, IRCICA, Istanbul, 2007.

This is almost a complete Muṣḥaf, missing just two folios.[36] Written on vellum (antelope skin) in Kūfic script, each folio measures 41×46 cm, the text area is 32×40 cm and in general there are 18 lines on every page. The Muṣḥaf is extensively marked with red dots, possibly by a later hand, bearing ad-Du'alī's dotting scheme. It also features big circular motifs after every 5th and 10th āyah and a rectangular device after every 100 āyahs. A wide horizontal band separates the sūras.

Dr. Altikulaç reports the following scribal errors: (a) in Q 2:57 «كلو» is repeated twice, as the last word in folio 5a and the first word in folio 5b; (b) in Q 6:152, «اذا» is misspelled «اذ»; (c) in Q 7:192, «ولا» is misspelled «وولا»; (d) in Q 8:48, «انى اخاف» is spelled with two *alifs* as «انى االخاف»; (e) in Q 14:16, «صديد» is misspelled «صدد»; (f) in Q 39:18, the second «لا» is missing in the verse «اولا الالبب»; (g) in Q 41:19, the *alif* from the end of the word «اعدا» is missing; (h) in Q 59:2, «ياولى» is misspelled «يالاولى»; and (i) in Q 59:13, «لانتم» is misspelled «لا انتم».[37] As the manuscript clearly shows the script, illumination and dotting of the Umayyad era, it cannot be one of ʿUthmān's master copies. But in Altikulaç's view the readings in this Muṣḥaf are closely related to the Muṣḥaf of Madinah.[38] A calligraphy expert, M. Serin, dates it to the turn of the second century A.H.[39]

iii. The Copy at Türk ve Islâm Eserleri Müzesi

Regarding the origins of this Muṣḥaf there is little information. Currently preserved at the Museum of Islamic Art in Istanbul as item no. 457, this Kūfic Muṣḥaf on vellum has also recently been reproduced as a facsimile edition.[40]

---

[36] The total number of folios is 408 [*ibid*, p. 73]. Seven folios, mostly from the beginning, exhibit a different handwriting and are possibly a later replacement for folios missing from the original [*ibid*, p. 75].

[37] *Ibid*, p. 75. An interesting observation is that the scribe had his own convention regarding when to write or drop the letter *alif*. It is well known that the practice of dropping *alif* was common in the early Muṣḥafs, see pp. 144 - 48. In this Muṣḥaf if a word usually written without *alif*, *eg.* «الملئكة», occurred at the end of the line, the *alif* was added. This allowed the word to be split in two, with «الملا» coming at the end of the first line and «ئكة» being shifted to the beginning of the next line [Altikulaç, op. cit., p. 76].

[38] *Ibid*, p. 76.

[39] *Ibid*, p. 81.

[40] Dr. Tayyar Altikulaç, *Hz. Osman'a Nisbet Edilen Mushaf-I Serîf (Türk ve Islâm Eserleri Müzesi Nüshasi)*, Islâm Arastirmalari Merkezi (ISAM), Istanbul, 1428/2007.

Figure 11.3: A folio from the 'Muṣḥaf 'Uthmān' at the Museum of Islamic Art, Istanbul.

The Muṣḥaf consists of 438 folios, constituting almost a complete copy of the Muṣḥaf.[41] Each folio measures 32×23 cm and has 15 lines on each side. Four short, slightly slanted lines are used as āyah separators with a different design for every fifth and tenth āyah. The sūra separators contain more detailed information than the ones in Topkapi. Evidently, the original scribe was very meticulous as not a single scribal error has been found; he was also remarkably consistent in his orthography.[42] Some of the letters in the Muṣḥaf have skeletal marks not in dot form but rather as short strokes slightly tilted to the left.[43] As for diacritical markings the Muṣḥaf follows ad-Du'alī's system. It seems that the scribe initially used black dots, instead of the red dots proposed by ad-Du'alī. Having realized his mistake he re-colored them red. In many instances the size of the red dot is slightly larger than the original black and is visible from the opposite side of the folio, and this necessitates caution when reading the manuscript if attention is not paid to which side the dot is on.[44] After careful examination Dr. Altikulaç concludes that the readings in this Muṣḥaf closely reflect the ones in the official Muṣḥaf of Baṣra.[45] Based on the paleographic evidence the Muṣḥaf is either from the second half of the first century or the first half of the second century A.H. (*c.* 670 – 766 C.E.).[46]

---

[41] There are three missing folios, aside from 14 lost folios which were replaced in 841 A.H./1437 C.E. by another scribe [*ibid*, p. 112 (Arabic introduction)].

[42] There are a few minor exceptions. For example the word *hunālika*, which occurs nine times, is spelled هنالك in five instances and هنلك in the other four [*ibid*, p. 114].

[43] *Ibid*, p. 114.

[44] *Ibid*, p. 115.

[45] *Ibid*, p. 116.

[46] *Ibid*, p. 120.

iv. The Copy at al-Mashhad al-Ḥusainī Mosque

This copy was preserved at the al-Mashhad al-Ḥusainī Mosque in Cairo prior to undergoing a recent restoration at the Central Library, which also digitally re-mastered it in 2006.

Figure 11.4: A side view of the 'Muṣḥaf 'Uthmān' at al-Mashhad al-Ḥusainī Mosque, Cairo. It is 40cm thick and weighs 80 kilograms.

Figure 11.5: A folio from the same Muṣḥaf. Courtesy of the Central Library, Ministry of Endowment, Egypt.

This is a huge copy of an almost complete Muṣḥaf, consisting of 1087 folios, each sized 57×68 cm with 12 lines per page. It is written on vellum in Kūfic script.[47] Some of the letters exhibit skeletal marks in the form of short tilted strokes. Āyah separation is also present. Here too Altikulaç has reported seeing a few minor scribal errors: (a) in Q 3:42, missing *alif* in «اصطفيك»; (b) in Q 3:47, the word «يمسنى» is written with a single *sīn*; (c) in

---

[47] *Ibid*, pp. 125-26. This information is from the CD-ROM published by the Central Library of Islamic Manuscripts, Ministry of Awqāf, Egypt.

Q 4:57, «سندخلهم» is misspelled «ندخلهم»; (d) in Q 6:157, missing *alif* in «أنا»; (e) in Q 7:17, «لاتينهم» is misspelled «لا اتينهم» … *etc.*[48] The original scribe was also inconsistent with his spellings, *e.g.* «على» and «حتى» are sometimes spelled «علا» and «حتا». Citing numerous reasons, Dr. Altikulaç concludes that this Muṣḥaf cannot be one of 'Uthmān's authorized copies. It may however be dated to the second half of the first century A.H. (late 7th/early 8th C.E.).[49] Based on its readings, its closest match is the Muṣḥaf of Kūfa.

v. The Copy at the Institute of Oriental Studies

The largest portion of this manuscript is held at the Institute of Oriental Studies, St. Petersburg (manuscript no. E20).[50] In 1998 E. Rezvan published an article detailing this manuscript and F. Déroche, who had published some Qur'ānic fragments at Katta Langar, identified both manuscripts as belonging to the same Muṣḥaf. Later on they independently discovered two more collections belonging to this Muṣḥaf, a folio at the Bīrūnī Institute of Oriental Studies, Tashkent and two folios at the Ibn Sīnā Bukhārā Regional Library.[51] Rezvan, who recently published a facsimile edition of this Muṣḥaf,[52] speculates that the E20 manuscript arrived in St. Petersburg through Central Asia.

This is an incomplete Muṣḥaf of 97 folios, constituting about 40% of the text of the Qur'ān. Each folio is sized 34×52.5 cm, and is written in late Hejāzī script with two different copyists involved.[53] To distinguish consonants most of the letters in this Muṣḥaf feature skeletal dots, though I posit that at least some of these are the work of a later scribe.[54] Āyah separators are present and unique to each copyist, with the first using a larger, more ornate pattern than the second. Colorful tenth and one-hundredth āyah markers, and ornamented illuminations between sūras, were appended by a later hand.[55] Radiocarbon dating of a fragment of this Muṣḥaf yielded the result 885±110 C.E./272±113 A.H. for a 95.4% confidence level. Rezvan's own paleographic analysis gives a date corresponding to the final quarter of the eighth century C.E. (*c.* 158-184 A.H.).[56] In light of its attributes neither seems satisfactory.

There are a few minor errors which were subsequently corrected by a later scribe: (a) in Q 7:130, letter «ن» is missing in «فرعون»; (b) in Q 10:28, first «و» is missing in «ويوم»; (c) in Q 26:42, «اذا» is missing in «اذا لمن»; (d) in Q 28:27, «ان» is missing in «ان انكحك»; (e) in Q 49:6, «ما» is missing in «على

---

[48] There are eleven additional minor errors which I have not listed here for the sake of brevity. For the full list, see *ibid*, pp. 127-28. Nine folios were added later as a replacement for missing portions; this list does not include any scribal errors present in the newer folios.

[49] *Ibid*, pp. 131-33.

[50] According to Rezvan, the copy at the Institute of Oriental Studies was bought in 1936 from an elderly lady who most likely purchased it from the library of I.G. Nofal, a professor of Arabic and Islamic law at the School of Oriental Languages of the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Nofal, a Lebanese Arab-Christian, was invited to teach there beginning in 1860. Towards the end of his life, his sons secretly sold off his library possessions to booksellers [E. Rezvan, *The Qur'ān of 'Uthmān (St. Petersburg, Katta-Langar, Bukhara, Tashkent)*, St. Petersburg Center for Oriental Studies, St. Petersburg, 2004, vol. 1, pp. 17-18].

[51] *Ibid*, p. 19.

[52] Rezvan, *The Qur'ān of 'Uthmān (St. Petersburg, Katta-Langar, Bukhara, Tashkent)*, op. cit. Images in the printed edition are all in black & white, but are in color on the accompanying DVD.

[53] The handwriting up to sūra 11 verse 14 is different from the handwriting in sūra 20 verse 89 and onward (the portion in-between is lost). So it is possible that the copyists shared the work evenly with each focusing on a different half of the Muṣḥaf. The number of lines per page varies widely as well [*ibid*, p. 61].

Figure 11.6: A folio from the 'Muṣḥaf 'Uthmān' held at the Institute of Oriental Studies, St. Petersburg.

---

[54] This is evident from two verses, Q 3:184 and 10:22, wherein dots were placed to make the text conform to the Muṣḥaf of Syria even though the skeletal backbone runs counter to it.

[55] *Ibid*, pp. 64-65.

[56] *Ibid*, p. 68.

«ما فعلتم»; (f) in Q 57:21, «ذا» is penned instead of «ذو», though the scribe inserted a small «و» before the *alif* to rectify his mistake.[57] Spellings lacks consistency, *e.g.* «حتى» is written «حتا» (in Q 4:43) and immediately in the next line is spelled «حتى».

4. Differences Between ʿUthmān's Master Copies and Existing Muṣḥafs Attributed to him

Among the dispatched Muṣḥafs of Madinah, Makkah, Kūfa, Baṣra and Shām (Syria), and ʿUthmān's own personal copy, the total skeletal variations amounted to forty-five characters spread throughout six Muṣḥafs. None of the multiple readings yields a contradiction in meaning. A survey of the differences between ʿUthmān's official copies, and the Muṣḥafs we have covered which are ascribed to him, is given in the table below. We opted to drop Muṣḥaf Tashkent from the list as it has been tampered with. Our table, while relying on the work of Altikulaç,[58] differs from his in that we list the words as they were penned by the original scribe (including orthography), not taking into account what changes may have been wrought by a later hand. An entry for the St. Petersburg Muṣḥaf, which Altikulaç did not study, has been added. Identical entries are like-colored while grey panels indicate that the folio is missing or that the manuscript is illegible.

	Sūra:verse	Madinah	Makkah	Kūfa	Baṣra	Shām	Topkapi	Islamic Art Museum	Cairo	St. Petersburg
1	2:116	وقالوا اتخذ	وقالوا اتخذ	وقالوا اتخذ	وقالوا اتخذ	قالوا اتخذ		وقالوا اتخذ	وقالوا اتخذ	
2	2:132	واوصى	ووصى	ووصى	ووصى	واوصى	واوصى	ووصى	واوصى	ووصى[59]
3	3:133	سارعوا	وسارعوا	وسارعوا	وسارعوا	سارعوا	سرعوا[60]	وسرعوا	وسرعوا	
4	3:184	والزبر والكتاب	والزبر والكتاب	والزبر والكتاب	والزبر والكتاب	وبالزبر والكتاب	والزبر والكتب	والزبر والكتب	والزبر والكتب	والزبر والكتب[61]
5	4:66	الا قليل	الا قليل	الا قليل	الا قليل	الا قليلا	الا قليل	الا قليل	الا قليل	الا قليل
6	5:53	يقول الذين	يقول الذين	ويقول الذين	ويقول الذين	يقول الذين	يقول الذين[62]	ويقول الذين	ويقول الذين	يقول الذين[63]
7	5:54	من يرتدد	من يرتد	من يرتد	من يرتد	من يرتدد	من يرتدد	من يرتد	من يرتدد	
8	6:32	وللدار	وللدار	وللدار	وللدار	ولدار	وللدار	وللدار	وللدار	
9	6:63	لئن انجيتنا	لئن انجيتنا	لئن انجينا	لئن انجيتنا	لئن انجيتنا	لئن انجيتنا	لئن انجيتنا	لئن انجيتنا	لئن انجيتنا
10	6:137	شركاوهم	شركاوهم	شركاوهم	شركاوهم	شركائهم	شركاهم	شركاوهم	شركاهم	شركاهم
11	7:3	تذكرون	تذكرون	تذكرون	تذكرون	يتذكرون	تذكرون	تذكرون	تذكرون	تذكرون
12	7:43	وما كنا لنهتدى	وما كنا لنهتدى	وما كنا لنهتدى	وما كنا لنهتدى	ما كنا لنهتدى	وما كنا لنهتدى	وما كنا لنهتدى	وما كنا لنهتدى	وما كنا لنهتدى
13	7:75	قال الملا	قال الملا	قال الملا	قال الملا	وقال الملا	قال الملا	قال الملا	قال الملا	قل الملا
14	7:141	واذ انجينكم	واذ انجينكم	واذ انجينكم	واذ انجينكم	واذ انجاكم	واذ انجينكم		واذ انجينكم	
15	9:100	تجرى تحتها	تجرى من تحتها	تجرى تحتها	تجرى تحتها	تجرى تحتها	تجرى تحتها	تجرى تحتها	تجرى تحتها	تجرى تحتها
16	9:107	الذين اتخذوا	والذين اتخذوا	والذين اتخذوا	والذين اتخذوا	الذين اتخذوا	الذين اتخذوا	والذين اتخذوا	والذين اتخذوا	الذين اتخذوا[64]
17	10:22	يسيركم	يسيركم	يسيركم	يسيركم	ينشركم	ينشركم	يسيركم	يسيركم	يسيركم[65]
18	17:93	قل سبحان	قال سبحان	قل سبحان	قل سبحان	قال سبحان	قل سبحن	قل سبحن	قل سبحن	
19	18:36	خيرا منهما	خيرا منهما	خيرا منها	خيرا منها	خيرا منهما	خيرا منهما	خيرا منها	خيرا منها	
20	18:95	ما مكنى	ما مكننى	ما مكنى	ما مكنى	ما مكنى	ما مكننى	ما مكنى	ما مكنى	
21	21:4	قل ربى	قل ربى	قال ربى	قل ربى	قل ربى	قل ربى	قل ربى	قل ربى	
22	21:30	اولم ير الذين	الم ير الذين	اولم ير الذين	اولم ير الذين	اولم ير الذين	اولم ير الذين	اولم ير الذين	اولم ير الذين	
23	23:87	سيقولون لله	سيقولون لله	سيقولون لله	سيقولون الله	سيقولون لله	سيقولون لله	سيقولون الله	سيقولون لله	
24	23:89	سيقولون لله	سيقولون لله	سيقولون لله	سيقولون الله	سيقولون لله	سيقولون لله	سيقولون الله	سيقولون لله	
25	23:112	قال كم لبثتم	قال كم لبثتم	قل كم لبثتم	قال كم لبثتم	قال كم لبثتم	قال كم لبثتم	قال كم لبثتم	قل كم لبثتم	
26	23:114	قال ان لبثتم	قال ان لبثتم	قل ان لبثتم	قال ان لبثتم	قال ان لبثتم	قال ان لبثتم	قال ان لبثتم	قل ان لبثتم	
27	25:25	ونزل الملئكة	وننزل الملئكة	ونزل الملئكة	ونزل الملئكة	ونزل الملئكة	ونزل الملئكة	ونزل الملئكة	ونزل الملئكة	ونزل الملئكة
28	26:217	فتوكل	وتوكل	وتوكل	وتوكل	فتوكل	فتوكل	وتوكل	فتوكل	
29	27:21	لياتينى	لياتيننى	لياتينى	لياتينى	لياتينى	لياتينى	لياتينى	لياتينى	
30	28:37	وقال موسى	قال موسى	وقال موسى	وقال موسى	وقال موسى	قال موسى	وقال موسى	وقال موسى	وقل موسى

---

[57] *Ibid*, pp. 144-45, table 13. There are a few others which Rezvan lists, but most of them have to do with dropping the *alif* (*e.g.* in Q 29:56, original «يعبدي» corrected by a later scribe to «ياعبادي»). As this was common practice in early writing [see pp. 144 - 48.], these cannot be counted alongside genuine errors.

[58] *Hz. Osman'a Nisbet Edilen Mushaf-I Serîf*, op. cit., pp. 150-52.

[59] A later scribe added *alif* so that it now reads, واوصى.

[60] Letter *wāw* added later, وسرعوا.

[61] Dot beneath the *alif's* serif of والزبر added later. Now reads وبالزبر.

[62] Letter *wāw* added later, ويقول.

[63] Letter *wāw* added later, ويقول.

[64] Letter *wāw* added later, والذين.

[65] Dots added later so as to make it ينشركم.

31	36:35	وما عملته	وما عملته	وما عملت	وما عملته	وما عملته	وما عملته	وما عملته	وما عملته	وما عملته
32	39:64	تامرونى	تامرونى	تامرونى	تامرونى	تامرونني	تامرونى	تامرونى	تامرونى	
33	40:21	اشد منهم	اشد منهم	اشد منهم	اشد منهم	اشد منكم	اشد منهم	اشد منهم	اشد منهم	
34	40:26	وان يظهر	وان يظهر	او ان يظهر	وان يظهر	وان يظهر	وان يظهر	او ان يظهر	او ان يظهر	
35	42:30	بما كسبت	فبما كسبت	فبما كسبت	فبما كسبت	بما كسبت	بما كسبت	فبما كسبت	فبما كسبت	
36	43:68	يعبادى	يعباد	يعباد	يعباد	يعبادي	يعبادى	يعباد	يعباد	
37	43:71	ما تشتهيه	ما تشتهى	ما تشتهى	ما تشتهى	ما تشتهيه	ما تشتهيه	ما تشتهى	ما تشتهى	
38	46:15	حسنا	حسنا	احسنا	حسنا	حسنا	حسنا	حسنا	حسنا	حسنا
39	47:18	ان تاتيهم	ان تاتهم	ان تاتهم	ان تاتيهم	ان تاتيهم	ان تاتيهم	ان تاتيهم	ان تاتهم	
40	55:12	ذو العصف	ذو العصف	ذو العصف	ذو العصف	ذا العصف	ذو العصف	ذو العصف	ذوا العصف[66]	ذا العصف[67]
41	55:78	ذى الجلل	ذى الجلل	ذى الجلل	ذى الجلل	ذو الجلل	ذى الجلال	ذى الجلل	ذى الجلل	ذو الجلل[68]
42	57:10	وكلا وعد الله	وكلا وعد الله	وكلا وعد الله	وكلا وعد الله	وكل وعد الله	وكل وعد الله[69]	وكلا وعد الله	وكلا وعد الله	وكلا وعد الله
43	57:24	الغنى	هو الغنى	هو الغنى	هو الغنى	الغنى	الغنى	هو الغنى	هو الغنى	الغنى[70]
44	91:15	فلا يخاف	ولا يخاف	ولا يخاف	ولا يخاف	فلا يخاف	ولا يخاف	ولا يخاف	ولا يخاف	

Orthographically, all the extant Muṣḥafs which are ascribed to 'Uthmān are confined in their readings to the acknowledged variants found in the five master copies of Madinah, Makkah, Kūfa, Baṣra and Shām. There is, however, one entry that obliges further elaboration. Entry no. 10 (Q 6:137) lists three variants, namely: «شركاوهم», «شركائهم» and «شركاهم». The last is not among the listed variants in any of the five dispatched Muṣḥafs. It is the same word placed within three different grammatical contexts. Depending on which diacritical mark is attached to the *hamza* (the choices are *fatha*, *ḍumma* or *kasra*), we construct the forms «شركاءهم», «شركاؤهم» or «شركائهم» respectively. The table below lists all occurrences of any of these three forms in the Qur'ān. There are no multiple readings at any of these positions (meaning that all five master copies agree), with the exception of Q 6:137 where the Muṣḥaf of Syria reads «شركائهم» in contrast to «شركاؤُهم», as found in the others. Red signs, where given, reflect the dotted diacritical markings found in the actual manuscript.

---

[66] Probably a scribal error.

[67] This is probably the wording in the original. A later scribe has erased it and written over it in red ink, ذو العصف.

[68] As in the previous footnote. Now written in red ink, ذي الجلل.

[69] A later scribe added *alif* and a note about multiple readings for this verse. Now reads, وكلا وعد الله.

[70] The word هو may have been added later. Difficult to resolve.

		Sura:verse	Topkapi	Museum of Islamic Art	Cairo	St. Petersburg
1	شركاَءهم	16:86	شركا°هم	شركا°هم	شركاهم	
2	شركاؤُهم	6:137	شركاۥهم	شركاوۥهم	شركاهم	شركاهم
		10:28	شركاوۥهم	شركاوۥهم	شركاوهم	شركوهم
3	شركائِهم	6:136	شركاىهم	شركاىهم	شركاىهم	شركيهم
		6:136	شركاىهم	شركاىهم	شركاىهم	شركئهم
		30:13	شركا°ىهم	شركاىهم	شركاىهم	
		30:13	شركا°ىهم	شركاىهم	شركاىهم	

So in Q 6:137 the Muṣḥaf at Topkapi reads «شركاؤهم» (the red dot lies after the *alif*, not beneath it, signifying a *ḍumma*); likewise the Muṣḥaf at the Museum of Islamic Art also reads «شركاؤهم» unambiguously. But what about the other two Muṣḥafs, is it «شركاؤهم» or «شركائهم» or something else? Without ad-Du'alī's dotting scheme to guide us it becomes difficult to say. We contend that the Muṣḥafs at Cairo and St. Petersburg in fact read «شركائهم»: (1) it was noted that the original copyists of both Muṣḥafs lacked consistency;[71] and (2) even these days the word «شركائهم» is often written «شركاهم», e.g. «شركة عمر وأحمد وشركاهم» instead of the more correct[72] «شركة عمر وأحمد وشركائهم».

Summarizing the table of differences,

		Topkapi	Islamic Art Museum	Cairo	St. Petersburg
Total positions		43	43	44	20
1	Madinah	38	28	29	16
2	Makkah	25	30	28	12
3	Kūfa	20	34	36	11
4	Baṣra	25	42	34	14
5	Shām	27	13	16	12

The table reads, the Muṣḥaf at Topkapi matches with 'Uthmān's official Muṣḥaf of Madinah in 38 places out of a maximum of 43, and in 25 places out of 43 for the Muṣḥaf of Makkah. From the material evidence we deduce that the Topkapi Muṣḥaf and the one at St. Petersburg are both closest to the Muṣḥaf of Madinah, while the one at the Museum of Islamic Art is almost perfectly congruent with the Muṣḥaf of Baṣra. The one in Cairo is held closest to the master copy sent to Kūfa.

---

[71] See pp. 179 - 82. As another example of the scribe's inconsistency in the Muṣḥaf at St. Petersburg: the word ثواب, occurring twice in the same verse (Q 4:134), is once spelled with *alif* and once without.

[72] Using an internet search engine we found: «شركاهم» with 484 hits, «شركاؤهم» with 4,410 hits and 23,300 hits for «شركائهم».

5. Other Muṣḥafs from the First Century A.H.

Recently Déroche and Noseda published facsimile editions of two sizeable Muṣḥafs, one preserved at Bibliothéque Nationale de France (BNF), Paris as Arabe 328a,[73] the other at the British Library (BL), London as Or 2165.[74] Written in Hejāzī Mā'il script, both belong to the first century A.H.[75]

We may summarize the differences between the five official Muṣḥafs of 'Uthmān and these two copies, as follows:

	Sūra:verse	Madinah	Makkah	Kūfa	Baṣra	Shām	BL Or 2165	BNF Arabe 328a
1	3:133	سارعوا	وسارعوا	وسارعوا	وسارعوا	سارعوا		سرعوا
2	3:184	والزبر والكتاب	والزبر والكتاب	والزبر والكتاب	والزبر والكتاب	وبالزبر والكتاب		وبالزبر والكتب
3	4:66	الا قليل	الا قليل	الا قليل	الا قليل	الا قليلا		الا قليلا
4	6:32	وللدار	وللدار	وللدار	وللدار	ولدار		ولدار
5	6:63	لئن انجيتنا	لئن انجيتنا	لئن انجينا	لئن انجيتنا	لئن انجيتنا		لئن انجيتنا
6	6:137	شركاوهم	شركاوهم	شركاوهم	شركاوهم	شركائهم		شركاهم
7	7:3	تذكرون	تذكرون	تذكرون	تذكرون	يتذكرون		يتذكرون
8	7:43	وما كنا لنهتدى	وما كنا لنهتدى	وما كنا لنهتدى	وما كنا لنهتدى	ما كنا لنهتدى	ما كنا لنهتدى	ما كنا لنهتدى
9	7:75	قال الملا	قال الملا	قال الملا	قال الملا	وقال الملا	وقل الملا	وقل الملا
10	7:141	واذ انجينكم	واذ انجينكم	واذ انجينكم	واذ انجينكم	واذ انجاكم	واذ انجكم	واذ انجكم
11	9:100	تجرى تحتها	تجرى من تحتها	تجرى تحتها	تجرى تحتها	تجرى تحتها		تجرى تحتها
12	9:107	الذين اتخذوا	والذين اتخذوا	والذين اتخذوا	والذين اتخذوا	الذين اتخذوا		الذين اتخذوا
13	10:22	يسيركم	يسيركم	يسيركم	يسيركم	ينشركم	ينشركم	ينشركم
14	17:93	قل سبحان	قال سبحان	قل سبحان	قل سبحان	قال سبحان	قل سبحن	
15	18:36	خيرا منهما	خيرا منهما	خيرا منها	خيرا منها	خيرا منهما	خيرا منهما	
16	18:95	ما مكنى	ما مكننى	ما مكنى	ما مكنى	ما مكنى	ما مكنى	
17	21:30	اولم ير الذين	الم ير الذين	اولم ير الذين	اولم ير الذين	اولم ير الذين	اولم ير الذين	

Figure 11.7: A folio from the Muṣḥaf kept at the British Library (Or. 2165).

---

[73] F. Déroche and S.N. Noseda (eds.), *Sources de la transmission manuscrite du texte Coranique, Les manuscrits de style ḥigāzī, Volume 1. Le manuscrit arabe 328(a) de la Bibliotheque nationale de France,* Fondazione Ferni Noja Noseda, Lesa, 1998. The 56 folios kept in the Bibliotheque Nationale make up 27% of the full text of the Qur'ān.

[74] F. Déroche and S.N. Noseda (eds.), *Sources de la transmission manuscrite du texte Coranique, Les manuscrits de style ḥigāzī, Volume 2, Tome I. Le manuscrit Or. 2165 (f. 1 à 61) de la British Library,* Fondazione Ferni Noja Noseda, Lesa, 2001. Tome 1 includes the first 61 folios of a total of 121 kept in the British Library as Or. 2165. These 121 folios encompass about 53% of the entire text of the Qur'ān.

[75] Both collections exhibit similar handwriting. Grohmann dates the one kept at the British Library to the first century ["Zum Problem Der Datierung Der Ältesten Koran-Handschriften" in H. Franke (Ed.), *Akten Des Vierundzwanzigsten Internationalen Orientalisten-Kongresses München, 28 August – 4 September 1957,* Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, Weisbaden, 1959, p. 272]. Based on the similarity of both manuscripts, Y. Dutton suggests re-dating the manuscripts to the time just prior to the reign of the Umayyad caliph Walīd (ruled 86-96 A.H.), *i.e.* prior to 85 A.H. ["Some Notes on the British Library's 'Oldest Qur'an Manuscript' (Or. 2165)", *Journal of Qur'ānic Studies*, vol. 8, no. 2 (2006), pp. 84-126].

Both Muṣḥafs, the one at BL (Or 2165) and that at BNF (Arabe 328a), tally in all but one place with the Muṣḥaf of Shām (Syria). Arabe 328a will, however, be in complete accord with the Muṣḥaf of Shām if we consider «شركاهم» to represent «شركائهم», a case we argued earlier. This is on par with the conclusion of Y. Dutton who showed that both manuscripts are written in the *qirā'at* (recitation style) of Ibn ʿĀmir (*d.* 118 A.H./736 C.E.),[76] which according to Ibn al-Jazarī was the reading used by the people of Syria up until the beginning of the sixth century A.H.[77]

6. Conclusion

As soon as Caliph ʿUthmān dispatched his official Muṣḥafs to different fronts, scholars painstakingly went through each of them and tabulated the differences in their texts. These amounted to forty-four places in the Qur'ān, a divergence of forty-five characters in a corpus nine thousand lines long. These stemmed from multiple readings, each emanating from the Prophet and so equally authoritative, none affecting the meaning or outcome of the verse involved. To grant each multiple reading its just due, Zaid bin Thābit consigned them to different copies rather than having to demote one or the other to secondary status. An unintended but fortuitous consequence of this act was that, all these centuries later, we can use the orthographic layout that is unique to each of the master copies to conclude whether any given Muṣḥaf is directly descended from one of these official Muṣḥafs. The details presented here reveal that the Muṣḥafs popularly ascribed to Caliph ʿUthmān are not truly ʿUthmānic, as none of them tallies perfectly with a master copy from beginning to end. But there are some that come intriguingly close. More heartening still is that every Muṣḥaf we have examined abides by one of the two multiple readings for each of the forty-four positions, a demarcation of what was acceptable in the earliest era of Islam beyond which these famous Muṣḥafs of the first and second centuries A.H., and indeed those printed in our own time, have never presumed to cross.

---

[76] Y. Dutton, "An Early *Muṣḥaf* According to the Reading of Ibn ʿĀmir", *Journal of Qur'ānic Studies*, vol. III, no. 1 (2001), pp. 71-89. See also Y. Dutton, "Some Notes on the British Library's 'Oldest Qur'an Manuscript' (Or. 2165)", *Journal of Qur'ānic Studies*, vol. 8, no. 2 (2006), pp. 84-126. Ibn ʿĀmir represents one of the seven unanimously accepted authoritative recitations of the Qur'ān.

[77] Ibn al-Jazarī, *Ghāyat an-Nihāyah fī Ṭabaqāt al-Qurrā'*, i:424, 292.

CHAPTER TWELVE

CAUSES OF VARIANT READINGS

One of the gateways for an Orientalist assault on the Qur'ān is distortion of the text itself. In my estimate there are over 250,000 copies of the Qur'ān in manuscript form, complete or partial, from the first century of Hijra onwards. Errors are classified in academic circles into the dual categories of deliberate and unintentional, and in this vast collection of manuscripts it is a certainty that many copyists must have committed unintentional errors. Scholars who deal with this subject know very well what fatigue or a momentary lapse of concentration can engender, as discussed at length in the following works: (1) Ernst Würthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament*, 2nd edition revised and enlarged, W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1995; (2) Bart D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1993; and (3) Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, 3rd enlarged edition, Oxford Univ. Press, 1992.

The first of these relates to the OT and the others to the NT. All three meticulously categorize mistakes of this nature with terms like transposition, haplography, and dittography, occasionally probing into the very mind of the now-deceased scribe to show what distraction must have flashed through his mind as he committed his silly mistake thousands of years ago.[1] But this same treatment is not afforded the Qur'ān, and in fact many errors – obvious scribal blunders resulting from exhaustion – are treated as genuine variants, as evidence of corruption in the Muslim Holy Book.

True that it is difficult to ascertain whether an error is intentional or deliberate; let us therefore tackle the two possibilities together, as the end result in both is textual corruption.

As we have seen, the ʿUthmāni Muṣḥaf was thoroughly dotless. Goldziher alleges that this dotlessness, both skeletal and diacritical, provoked divergences in the readings of the Qur'ān. Thus a skeleton such as ڡىل, can possess several possible readings such as: فيل, قُتِل, قِيل, قَبّل, قُبل, قَبْل. These mean, respectively: elephant, he was killed, it was said, to kiss, front portion of the body and before.[2] In this chapter I aim to negate the idea that dotless Arabic

---

[1] Refer to pp. 280 - 81 and pp. 320 - 23.

[2] For a discussion on when such a text, lacking dots, can cause corruption and when it is harmless, refer to section 3 of this chapter.

1. Variations due to lack of skeletal dots. Three examples will suffice:
   a. وما كنتم تستكبرون can be read: وما كنتم تستكثرون.[16]
   b. إذا ضربتم في سبيل الله فتبينوا can be read: إذا ضربتم في سبيل الله فتثبتوا.[17]
   c. وهو الذي يرسل الرياح بشرا can be read: وهو الذي يرسل الرياح نشرا.[18]
2. Variations due to lack of diacritical markings.

For those unfamiliar with the history of *qirā'at* such examples may seem valid. But all theories must be tested before they can be deemed viable, and the study of Islam is unfortunately littered with ones that have been drafted and pressed into service without the benefit of testing. So let us evaluate this premise.

Jeffery and Goldziher completely ignore the tradition of oral scholarship, the mandate that only through qualified instructors can knowledge be gained. A great many Qur'ānic phrases contextually allow the inclusion of more than one set of dots and diacritical marks, but in the lion's share of cases, scholars recite them in just one way. Where variations arise (and this is rare) the skeleton of both readings remains faithful to the 'Uthmāni Muṣḥaf, and each group can justify its reading based on a chain of authority extending back to the Prophet.[19] With this we can easily dismiss the notion of each reciter whimsically supplying his own dots and marks. Had there been even a semblance of fact in this theory, consider then the number of reciters and the thousands of skeletons that can be read in four or five ways; would not the list of variants run into hundreds of thousands or perhaps millions? In the Muṣḥaf's entirety Ibn Mujāhid (*d.* 324 A.H.) counted roughly one thousand multiple readings only.[20] To compare theory with reality is to demonstrate the fallacy of this hypothesis.

A few concrete examples will help to cement my point.

---

[16] Qur'ān 7:48. This is a false example, see Ibn Mujāhid, *Kitāb as-Sab'a*, pp. 281-2.

[17] Qur'ān 4:94.

[18] Qur'ān 7:57.

[19] The Muslim community at large did not trouble itself with *isnāds* when memorizing the Qur'ān, because this was impractical and unnecessary for the layman given the Qur'ān's ubiquitous presence in every home and on every tongue. Professional reciters and scholars did follow *isnāds* however, as they were guardians entrusted with making sure that the text reaching the public was accurate and free of corruptions. Even I, writing in the 15th century A.H./21st century C.E. can provide an *isnād* for the recitation of the Qur'ān.

[20] Scholars examining 'Uthmān's official copies noted differences in roughly forty characters; these were based on divergences in the skeleton itself. Ibn Mujāhid's one thousand multiple readings are due to the varying placement of dots and marks on this skeletal backbone, in addition to the skeletal differences outlined in Chapter 11.

(a) First example (in the first column, the word in question is marked in a different color; the middle column is the sūra:verse reference):

مَٰلِكِ يَوْمِ ٱلدِّينِ	1:3	Some read مالك others مِلك
قُلِ ٱللَّهُمَّ مَٰلِكَ ٱلْمُلْكِ	3:26	Unanimously read مالك
مَلِكِ ٱلنَّاسِ ۝٢ إِلَٰهِ ٱلنَّاسِ	113:2-3	Unanimously read مِلك

The colored word can be contextually read in all three verses as either مالك or ملك.

(b) Second example:

وَإِن يَرَوْاْ سَبِيلَ ٱلرُّشْدِ	7:146	Some رُشْد others رَشَد
وَهَيِّئْ لَنَا مِنْ أَمْرِنَا رَشَدًا	18:10	Unanimously read رَشَدا
لِأَقْرَبَ مِنْ هَٰذَا رَشَدًا	18:24	Unanimously read رَشَدا
أَن تُعَلِّمَنِ مِمَّا عُلِّمْتَ رُشْدًا	18:66	Some رُشْدا others رَشَدا
يَهْدِيٓ إِلَى ٱلرُّشْدِ	72:2	Unanimously read رُشْد
أَمْ أَرَادَ بِهِمْ رَبُّهُمْ رَشَدًا	72:10	Unanimously read رَشَدا
فَأُوْلَٰٓئِكَ تَحَرَّوْاْ رَشَدًا	72:14	Unanimously read رَشَدا
لَآ أَمْلِكُ لَكُمْ ضَرًّا وَلَا رَشَدًا	72:21	Unanimously read رَشَدا

Lexicographically both forms are valid in each case.

(c) Third example:

مَا لَا يَمْلِكُ لَكُمْ ضَرًّا وَلَا نَفْعًا	5:76	Unanimously read ضَرًّا
لَآ أَمْلِكُ لِنَفْسِي نَفْعًا وَلَا ضَرًّا	7:188	Unanimously read ضَرًّا
لَآ أَمْلِكُ لِنَفْسِي ضَرًّا وَلَا نَفْعًا	10:49	Unanimously read ضَرًّا
وَلَا يَمْلِكُ لَهُمْ ضَرًّا وَلَا نَفْعًا	20:89	Unanimously read ضَرًّا
وَلَا يَمْلِكُونَ لِأَنفُسِهِمْ ضَرًّا وَلَا نَفْعًا	25:3	Unanimously read ضَرًّا
لَا يَمْلِكُ بَعْضُكُمْ لِبَعْضٍ نَّفْعًا وَلَا ضَرًّا	34:42	Unanimously read ضَرًّا
إِنْ أَرَادَ بِكُمْ ضَرًّا	48:11	Some read ضَرًّا others ضُرًّا

Again, lexicographically both forms are valid in each case.[21]

I can spill much ink in citing more examples, but the above are sufficient to prove my point. There are literally thousands of instances where two forms of a word are both contextually valid but only one is collectively used;

---

[21] For a detailed study of this topic, see 'Abdul-Fattāḥ al-Qāḍī, "al-Qirā'āt fī Naẓar al-Mustashriqīn wa al-Mulḥidīn", *Majallat al-Azhar*, Ramaḍān 1390/1970 onwards.

He argues that aside from the lack of dots (which I have responded to), variances also surfaced because some reciters utilized texts predating ʿUthmān's Muṣḥaf, texts that occasionally differed from the ʿUthmāni skeleton and were not destroyed despite the caliph's orders.[28] But this claim is brandished without any supporting evidence. His collection of variants from Ibn Masʿūd's Muṣḥaf, for example, is void from the start because none of his references even cites a 'Muṣḥaf of Ibn Masʿūd'. Most of his evidence simply states that Ibn Masʿūd recited this verse in that way with no proof or chains of narration; it is nothing more than gossip, pure hearsay, and to elevate it from its low character and use it as an argument against well-proven recitations, is to refuse the distinction between a narrator's honesty and falsehood.[29]

Jeffery's allegations extend beyond Ibn Masʿūd however, so here I will briefly tackle an aberrant report which states that Caliph ʿAlī read a verse in contradiction to the ʿUthmāni Muṣḥaf. The reading is: والعصر ونوائب الدهر، إن الإنسان لفي خسر (adding two extra words in verse 103:1).[30] The author of *al-Mabānī*[31] denounces this report as false on three counts:

a. ʿĀṣim bin Abī an-Najūd, one of the most prominent students of as-Sulamī, who in turn was ʿAlī's most respected student, relates that ʿAlī read this verse exactly as given in the ʿUthmāni Muṣḥaf.
b. ʿAlī ascended to the caliphate after ʿUthmān's assassination. Had he believed his predecessor to be guilty of omitting certain words, surely it was his obligation to rectify the error. Else he would have been accused of betraying his faith.
c. ʿUthmān's efforts enjoyed the backing consensus of the entire Muslim community; ʿAlī himself said that no one voiced any objections, and were he displeased he would certainly have been vociferous.[32]

This scene alone, of the Prophet's Companions in their thousands eyeing the bonfire as old Qur'ānic fragments were tossed in, is a powerful testimony that they all assented to the purity of the Muṣḥaf's text. No additions, subtractions, or corruptions. Anyone who rejects this view and brings forth something new, claiming it as a pre-ʿUthmānic text favored by this or that Companion, is slandering the very faith of these individuals. Even Ibn Abī Dāwūd, author of *al-Maṣāḥif* and the purveyor of many variant *qirā'ats* which clash with the ʿUthmāni text, categorically denies their value as Qur'ān. "We do not submit that anyone should recite the Qur'ān except what is in ʿUthmān's Muṣḥaf," he writes. "If anyone recites in his prayer against this Muṣḥaf, I will order him to re-do his prayer."[33]

The formative stages of the OT and NT occurred in epochs of great volatility, the political realities throwing the two texts into complete disarray. In seeking to replicate these vices in the Qur'ānic text, Western scholars view all Muslim evidence with a jaundiced eye whilst the OT and NT are given the benefit of the doubt whenever possible.[34] While misgivings on the authenticity of his variant material linger in Jeffery's mind, he nevertheless fills his book with them.

> Some of the variants seem linguistically impossible.... Some give one the impression of being the inventions of later philologers.... The great majority, however, *merit* consideration as genuine survivals from the pre-ʿUthmānic stage of the text, though only after they have passed the most searching criticism of modern scholarship... shall we be free to use them in the attempted reconstruction of the history of the text.[35]

This merit, and Jeffery's "searching criticism of modern scholarship", are sadly nothing more than slogans flaunted about with little or no meaning.

5. Altering a Word for its Synonym During Recitation

Goldziher, Blachère and others uphold that in early Muslim society, changing a word in the Qur'ān for its synonym was perfectly tolerable.[36] Their basis for this claim is two-pronged:

- Aṭ-Ṭabarī reports through ʿUmar that the Prophet said, "O ʿUmar, all of the Qur'ān is correct [*i.e.* it remains valid even if you inadvertently skip some verses], unless you mistakenly slip from a verse espousing Allāh's mercy for one that pronounces His wrath, and vice versa".[37]

  This *ḥadīth* has proven itself a fertile ground for active imaginations, for those insisting that synonyms could be used freely so long as the

---

[28] See Jeffery (ed.), *al-Maṣāḥif*, Introduction, pp. 7-8.

[29] Ibn Masʿūd's 'Muṣḥaf', and Jeffery's analysis of it, are important topics for which I have devoted much of Chapter 14.

[30] A. Jeffery, *Materials*, p. 192.

[31] A. Jeffery (ed.), *Muqaddimatān*, pp. 103-4.

[32] See pp. 102 - 03.

[33] Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *al-Maṣāḥif*, pp. 53-54.

[34] Recently I re-read the cover jacket of Juynboll's work, *Muslim Tradition*, whose cover picture is taken from the oldest *dated* Arabic manuscript on record written on paper (as opposed to papyrus). The note reads (emphasis added): "This manuscript was *allegedly* copied in 252 A.H./866 A.D." How often can we see such cynicism in Orientalist dealings with the OT and NT?

[35] A. Jeffery, *Materials*, Preface, p. x. Emphasis added.

[36] R. Blachère, *Introduction au Coran*, 1947, pp. 69-70; see also ʿAbduṣ-Ṣabūr Shāhīn, *Tārīkh al-Qur'ān*, pp. 84-85.

[37] Aṭ-Ṭabarī, *Tafsīr*, i:13.

spirit of the words was sustained. Was this ever the case? We know from our legalistic dealings that no author will consent to have his wording replaced by a slew of synonyms, irrespective of how accurately chosen. In the Qur'ān's case, not being the product of earthly authorship, even the Prophet did not possess the authority to alter its verses. So how is it that he should allow others to do so?[38] If a person misquotes an office clerk accidentally, its impact may be minimal, but misquoting a magistrate will instigate far greater repercussions; how then if one *intentionally* misquotes the Almighty Himself?

Anyone with a habit of reciting from memory knows well how easily the mind can slip, jumping to another sūra half a Muṣḥaf away while the person continues unaware. In fearing mistakes of this nature, people may have chosen to refrain entirely from reciting from memory. Ever mindful of encouraging his Companions to memorize and recite as much as possible, the Prophet's statement was a great relief to the community's apprehensions on this account.

- The second basis for this Orientalist claim is that, in many instances, the *qirā'at* of Ibn Mas'ūd and others were peppered with exegetical commentary (قراءة تفسيرية). Al-Bukhārī records the following:

> Narrated Nāfi', "Whenever Ibn 'Umar recited the Qur'ān he would not speak to anyone till he had finished. Once I held the Qur'ān while he recited *Sūra al-Baqara* from memory; he stopped abruptly at a certain verse and asked, 'Do you know in what connection this verse was revealed?' I replied, 'No'. He said, 'It was revealed in connection with such-and-such,' and then resumed his recitation".[39]

From this we deduce that some scholars proffered explanatory notes to their listeners during the course of recitation.[40] This cannot be considered a valid variance in *qirā'at* nor can we assume it to be part of the Qur'ān. Some Orientalists allege that these scholars were attempting to improve upon the Qur'ān's text; such a claim is blasphemous, insinuating that the Companions regarded themselves as more competent than Allāh the All-Knowing, the All-Wise.

---

[38] Qur'ān 10:15 reads: "And if Our verses are recited to them in all their clarity, those who do not wish to meet Us retort, 'Bring us a Qur'ān other than this, or alter it'. Say [O Muḥammad], 'It is not for me to change it of my own accord; I only follow what is revealed to me. I dread, should I disobey my Lord, the punishment of a most tremendous day'".

[39] Al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, vi:38, *ḥadīth* no. 50.

[40] 'Abduṣ-Ṣabūr Shāhīn, *Tārīkh al-Qur'ān*, pp. 15-16. Here Goldziher admits that some of the additions were exegetical in nature.

6. Conclusion

Having examined Jeffery and Goldziher's hypotheses, and considered the appropriate evidence, we have no recourse but to cast their theories aside. The variations they predict are nowhere to be found, in countless instances where a skeleton can contextually admit more than one set of dots and markings; the rare cases of authoritative divergence in *qirā'at* by their very nature harbor no impact on the meaning of the text.[41] Goldziher himself acknowledged this,[42] as did Margoliouth:

> In numerous cases the ambiguity of the script which lead to a variant reading was of little consequence.[43]

In their eagerness to prove textual corruption on a par with the OT and NT, Orientalists discount the religio-political condition of the newly born Muslim state, and how it differed from the turmoil of the Judeo-Christian communities in their infancies. The disparity could not be more striking. A child of well-established lineage is being compared with one abandoned before an orphanage, and the irony is that in determining the parentage of this known child, the procedure for the abandoned one is being insisted on. I have endeavored to show the gaping flaws in Orientalist logic but I suspect that these observations will be brushed-off by that camp. To snub a body of work which does not sit well with one's own motives and research, rather than to contend with it scientifically, is always the simplest path.[44] Here I simply seek to point out the fallacy of their approaches, but I am well aware that these duels of refutation must end somewhere as otherwise Muslim scholars will be kept busy in an endless war of words.

---

[41] A far cry from many of the biblical variations found in manuscripts, such as John 1:18 ("an only One, God" and "the only begotten Son"), which contain a world of difference. And according to P.W. Comfort, the literal translation is "a unique God" [*Early Manuscripts & Modern Translations of the New Testament*, Baker Books, 1990, p. 105]. For details see the discussion on manuscript 𝔭*75* (Bodmer Papyrus XIV-XV) in pp. 320 - 21.

[42] 'Abdul-Ḥalīm Najjār, *Madhāhib at-Tafsīr al-Islāmī*, pp. 12-13.

[43] D.S. Margoliouth, "Textual Variations", *The Moslem World*, vol. 15, no. 4 (Oct. 1925), p. 340.

[44] Much of my early work, such as *Studies in Early Ḥadīth Literature*, my criticism of Goldziher, and *On Schacht's Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence* (a work devoted to refuting Schacht), are serious academic works which have been generally ignored in Western academic circles because the findings therein are judged 'unacceptable'. Often the best a traditionalist Muslim work achieves is to be cited for further reading at the end, branded in a separate category under the umbrella of 'Islamic Perspective'. [See for example John Burton, *An Introduction to the Hadith*, Edinburgh Univ. Press, 1994, p. 206].

As for the pious Muslim there can be no question that Allāh, vowing repeatedly to preserve His Book, would never have nominated a 'defective' language or script to carry the burden of His final revelations. In its literary vigor, depth of expression, poeticism, and orthographic and paleographic capacity, Arabic was sufficiently advanced that Allāh blessed it as His choice from among all others. And from then it was the privilege of the Muslim masses to continue reciting it in the original, and to incorporate markings so that non-Arabs may also recite the original with ease.

Long have I alluded to the Islamic methodology and its pivotal role in preserving the *qirāʾat* of the Qurʾān and the *sunna* of the Prophet throughout the centuries. Examining this methodology in detail is the aim of my next chapter.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

THE MUSLIM EDUCATIONAL METHODOLOGY[1]

The Jewish and Christian Scriptures suffered at the hands of the very people who were entrusted with its stalwart defense. Whereas in previous chapters our aim was to acquire familiarity with Muslim conduct towards both the Qurʾān and *sunna*, due appreciation of these endeavors might perhaps not come about until they are thrown into the sharpest relief through comparison with the biblical Scriptures. A detailed discussion of the Muslim educational methodology becomes indispensable in this regard—a unique science, unsurpassable even now, which was instrumental in the faithful preservation of the Qurʾān and *sunna* in compliance with the Divine Will:

﴿ إِنَّا نَحۡنُ نَزَّلۡنَا ٱلذِّكۡرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُۥ لَحَٰفِظُونَ ٩ ﴾[2]

> "We have, without doubt, sent down the message; and We will assuredly guard it [from corruption]."

Because the Qurʾān explicitly affirms that the Scriptures were corrupted from within, the Muslim community felt a pressing need to safeguard the Qurʾān from all dubious influences. Throughout Islamic history the *ḥuffāẓ*, committing the Book fully to heart and numbering in their millions, from adolescents to the elderly, served as one cornerstone of this safeguard; this alone was more than the Torah and Gospels ever enjoyed, but the precautions did not end there.

To write a book using a false name is tremendously easy; in the literary world the use of pen names is commonplace. Similarly, it is possible to tamper with someone else's work then republish it under the original author's name. How can such mischievous doings be prevented? In seeking

---

[1] This chapter is highly specialized; its main purpose is to illustrate how Muslim scholars devised a unique system for transmission of knowledge, which proved vital in both evaluating the accuracy of the information as well as safeguarding it from internal and external corruptions. This is, in fact, a very brief discussion, and anyone with further interest in this topic is advised to refer to my forthcoming book, *Islamic Studies: What Methodology?* Inevitably there are other readers who will find this chapter taxing, and may indeed choose to skip to this chapter's conclusion, as it will not hinder their understanding of subsequent chapters (though it may hinder their full appreciation of them).

[2] Qurʾān 15:9.

Figure 13.1: Chart of the transmission chains for the prayer ḥadīth. Source: Al-Aʿẓamī, On Schacht's Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence, *pp. 158-59.*

Limiting ourselves to just one Companion, Abū Huraira, we note that at least seven of his students transmitted this *ḥadīth* from him; four of these belonged to Madinah, two to Egypt, and one to Yemen. They in turn transmitted to at least twelve others: five from Madinah, two from Makkah, and one each from Syria, Kūfa, Ṭā'if, Egypt, and Yemen. Similar patterns from the other Companions indicate that the *ḥadīth* marked its presence in other lands (Baṣra, Ḥimṣ and Wāsiṭ) while reinforcing itself in Madinah, Makkah, Kūfa, Egypt, and Syria. The above figure, illustrating

these colossal chains of transmission, is of course for only one *ḥadīth* out of tens of thousands.

4. The Authentication of Isnād and Ḥadīth

In the minds of *ḥadīth* scholars, the final acceptance of a report did not rest solely on its authenticity. In fact accuracy and authenticity were both insufficient in the eyes of the *muḥaddithīn* (المحدثين: scholars of *ḥadīth*), for they sought three more conditions:

1. All narrators in the chain had to be *thiqa* (ثقة: trustworthy).[16]
2. The chain of transmission had to be unbroken.
3. Positive support for the statement from all available evidence was a prerequisite.

i. Establishing Trustworthiness

Ascertaining a narrator's reliability depends on two criteria: (a) morality and (b) sound knowledge.

A. MORALITY

Here is how the Qur'ān describes the qualifications of a witness:

﴿ وَأَشْهِدُوا۟ ذَوَىْ عَدْلٍ مِّنكُمْ ﴾[17]

> "... and take for witness two persons from among you, endued with justice."

﴿ مِمَّن تَرْضَوْنَ مِنَ ٱلشُّهَدَآءِ ﴾[18]

> "... such as you approve of, for witnesses."

ʿUmar used the phrase «فأنت عندنا العدل الرضا» when addressing ʿAbdur-Raḥmān bin ʿAuf ("To us you are righteous and approved of"). The word *ʿadl* (عدل: of righteous conduct), delineating an Islamically sound character, is defined more concretely by as-Suyūṭī:[19]

«أن يكون مسلماً، بالغاً، عاقلاً، سليماً من أسباب الفسق، وخوارم المروءة»

"[It refers to] a Muslim who has reached maturity, is mentally sound, free from the causes of indecency, and who abides by the standards and norms of his community." Ibn al-Mubārak (118-181 A.H.) also defines personal character, stating that an acceptable narrator must:

---

[16] The word *thiqa* is here used in its linguistic meaning. It is not a *ḥadīth* term.

[17] Qur'ān 65:2.

[18] Qur'ān 2:282.

[19] As-Suyūṭī, *Tadrīb*, i:300.

- Pray in congregation (صلاة الجماعة).
- Avoid *nabīdh* (نبيذ), a drink prone to fermentation if stored for long periods.
- Avoid falsehood throughout his adult life.
- Be free from any mental disqualifications.[20]

A man may ascend the scholarly ladder to great heights, but if his morals are doubtful then a *ḥadīth* narrated by him is rejected even if it is true.[21] The *muḥaddithīn's* consensus is that all scholars—with the exception of the Companions, whose character has been vouched for by Allāh and his Prophet—require this testimony of righteous conduct if their word is to be accepted. Here is an example:

56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure 13.2: A page from Nuskhat Abū az-Zubair bin ʿAdī al-Kūfī

---

[20] Al-Khaṭīb, *al-Kifāya*, p. 79.

[21] Al-Aʿẓamī, *Studies in Early Hadith Literature*, p. 305.

This manuscript, *Nuskhat Abū az-Zubair bin ʿAdī al-Kūfī*, is well known to be spurious (النسخة الموضوعة) even though the text of the *ḥadīths* themselves is not. Most of the material in this fraudulent copy actually consists of authentic *ḥadīths* narrated by Anas bin Mālik, a renowned Companion. But the transmission chain is defective: Bishr b. Ḥusain, a narrator, claims to have learned these *ḥadīths* from az-Zubair b. ʿAdī, who in turn was among Anas b. Mālik's pupils. Bishr b. Ḥussain's reputation is so infamous that the *muḥaddithīn* have branded him as a 'liar' and demonstrated that this narrative chain never occurred, being a pure fabrication on Bishr's part. The page shown contains ten *ḥadīths*; al-Bukhārī and/or Muslim have cited the core text of six as genuine, with three others cited by Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal. But the forged *isnād*, though appended to authentic sayings of the Prophet, invalidates the book's value as a reference.[22]

Discovering a narrator's duplicity, through inspection of historical data and the scrutiny of books and the kinds of papers and inks used, is often too difficult. In most cases one is forced to rely on the narrator's contemporaries to uncover his morality and characteristics. Given that enmity or favor may sometimes influence the recommendation of peers, scholarly deliberations have resulted in guidelines which allow the researcher to proceed with due caution.[23]

B. SOUNDNESS OF KNOWLEDGE (TESTING LITERARY ACCURACY)

Most narrators' mistakes cannot be ascribed to malice, but naturally these errors must be catalogued in the course of assessing the narrator. Testing accuracy entails extensive cross-checking. To grasp the full scope of this we turn to the celebrated scholar Ibn Maʿīn (*d.* 233 A.H.), in a case likely belonging to the second century. He went in to see ʿAffān, a pupil of the great scholar Ḥammād b. Salama (*d.* 169 A.H.), to read the works of Ḥammād back to him. Surprised that a scholar of Ibn Maʿīn's caliber was approaching him, ʿAffān inquired whether he had read these books to any of Ḥammād's other students. He replied, "I have read these to seventeen of his students before coming to you". "By Allāh," ʿAffān exclaimed, "I am not going to read them to you". Unfazed, Ibn Maʿīn answered that by spending a few dirhams he could travel to Baṣra and read there to other students of Ḥammād. True to his word Ibn Maʿīn soon found himself amid the busy streets of Baṣra, and went to Mūsā b. Ismāʿīl (another of Ḥammād's pupils). Mūsā asked him, "Have you not read these books to anyone else?"[24] He answered, "I have read them completely to seventeen of Ḥammād's students and you are the eighteenth".

---

[22] See al-Aʿẓamī, op. cit., pp. 305, 309-10.

[23] Al-Yamānī, *at-Tankīl*, pp. 52-59.

[24] One may wonder why these two pupils asked Ibn Maʿīn the same question. The reason was simple: for Ibn Maʿīn, a giant scholar of the 2nd and 3rd centuries, to approach a lower grade of teachers for reading a book was certainly cause for astonishment.

Mūsā wondered what he intended to do with all these readings and Ibn Maʿīn replied, "Ḥammād b. Salama committed errors and his students compounded a few more to his. So I want to distinguish between Ḥammād's mistakes and those of his students. If I find all of Ḥammād's pupils committing a mistake unanimously, then the source of the mistake is Ḥammād. If I find the majority saying one thing, and a lone student saying another, then that student is responsible for that particular error. In this way I can distinguish between his mistakes and those of his students".[25]

Following this protocol enabled Ibn Maʿīn to grade the various students and determine their individual competence. Such was the fundamental basis for assessing *ḥadīth* narrators and placing them into categories. Ibn Maʿīn did not invent this method nor was he the first to apply it, but as far as I know he was the first to express it clearly. In fact this scheme was in usage from the time of Caliph Abū Bakr, and though there was a difference in the quantity of documents cross-referenced, the quality of these efforts remained.[26]

c. Classification of Narrators

The pairing of *ʿadl* and sound knowledge within a person earned him the general title of 'trustworthy' (ثقة). Among the *muḥaddithīn* some graded more specifically by using these traits to establish twelve categories. Ibn Ḥajar for instance grouped narrators into the following classes, the first six of which can be construed as passing marks:[27]

1. The Companions, listed foremost for their preeminence.
2. Narrators of confirmed exemplary status, signified by such labels as أوثق الناس (among the most trustworthy of people) and ثقة حافظ (trustworthy with exceptional memory).
3. Those extolled with a single adjective such as ثقة (trustworthy), ثبت (steady of tongue and reasoning) and متقن (one who has mastered the subject).
4. Those of slightly lesser grade, among them صدوق (truthful) and لا بأس به (of no objectionable quality)
5. Of lower rank still, including صدوق سيء الحفظ (truthful but with faltering memory) and صدوق يخطئ (truthful but prone to errors). Also in this category are those accused of innovations such as Shiites and the Jahmiyyah (a sect which denied certain attributes of Allāh though it may be confirmed in the Qur'ān and the *sunna*). Their affiliation to such sects must be made clear.
6. Those whose output is meager but to whose discredit nothing is known. They are classed as مقبول (acceptable).

---

[25] Ibn Ḥibbān, *Majrūḥīn*, vii:11a.

[26] Al-Aʿẓamī, *Hadith Methodology*, pp. 52-53.

[27] Ibn Ḥajar, *Taqrīb at-Tahdhīb*, pp. 74-75.

7. Those who have been transmitted from through more than one channel, but have not been assessed, so that they are مجهول الحال (of unknown quality).
8. One whose status has not been gauged by a recognized authority, but who has been otherwise labeled inadequate even if this allegation was not further clarified. Such an individual is ضعيف (weak).
9. A person who has not been assessed and who has not been transmitted from, except through a single channel, is branded as مجهول (unknown).
10. The designation here is متروك (abandoned) or ساقط (dropped).
11. Whoever is accused of falsehood.
12. Whoever is a proven كذّاب (liar) or وضّاع (fabricator).

This emphasis on the ranking of narrators necessitated access to the biographies of the transmitters involved, and to accommodate this a new science evolved, *al-Jarḥ wa at-Taʿdīl* (الجرح والتعديل), offering a massive biographical library which ran into thousands of volumes.[28]

ii. The Unbroken Chain

As the narrator's trustworthiness is the first prerequisite for accepting a report, so the presence of an unbroken chain is the second. This chain is the *isnād*. Establishing the value of any *isnād* first involves a study of the participating transmitters' biographies (in our previous example, persons ***A***, ***B*** and ***C***); once they pass the checks on morality and sound knowledge we are ready to judge the *isnād* itself. We must confirm that the individuals learned the statement from one another: if ***C*** did not learn directly from ***B***, or if ***B*** never came into contact with ***A***, then the chain is clearly defective. If we do discover an unbroken chain however, our analysis is not yet complete.

iii. Supporting or Negating Evidence

The final step is a comprehensive cross-examination of other *isnāds*. Suppose we have another pair of trustworthy scholars, ***E*** and ***F***, who also transmit from ***A***, such that we have the chain ***A-E-F***. If they convey a statement about ***A*** which matches that of ***A-B-C*** then this further strengthens our case, called *mutābaʿa* (متابعة). But what if the two are not congruous? If ***E*** and ***F*** are of an even higher caliber than ***B*** and ***C***, this weakens the latter's report; in this case the ***A-B-C*** transmission is classed as *shādh* (شاذ: aberrant). The presence of a third or fourth chain complementing ***A-E-F***'s version helps solidify the argument against ***A-B-C***. If scholars ***E*** and ***F*** are of the same caliber as ***B*** and ***C*** however, then ***A*** will be cited as *muḍṭarib* (مضطرب: perplexed). Should ***A-B-C*** state something which contradicts ***A-E-F*** but is in line with hundreds of other reports (from sources other than ***A***), then ***A-E-F***'s account is discarded.

---

[28] Ḥājī Khalīfa, *Kashf aẓ-Ẓunūn*, ii:1095-108.

iv. A Test Case with a Misleading Isnād

Very odd stories are occasionally conceived. Lacking a strong knowledge of chain criticism, numerous scholars (and in rare instances even famous *muḥaddithīn*) bring forward a false report and expend much energy in its defense or refutation. For example adh-Dhahabī quotes from al-Aʿmash, "I *heard* (سمعت) Anas b. Mālik [an eminent Companion] reciting إن ناشئة الليل هي أشد وطأً وأصوب قيلا. When told, 'O Anas, it is وأقوم,' he replied, 'أقوم and أصوب are the same'". Adh-Dhahabī claims the chain to be authentic,[29] and 'Abdus-Ṣabūr Shāhīn, attempting to somehow validate this incident, attributes Anas' response to the seven *aḥruf*.[30] Yet according to the pioneers of *ḥadīth* criticism al-Aʿmash never learned anything from Anas, as evidenced by his following remark:

> Anas b. Mālik would pass by me every morning and evening. I used to tell myself, 'I will never stoop to learning from you Anas, for after serving the Prophet in his lifetime you approached al-Ḥajjāj for an appointment, till he agreed to appoint you'. Now I feel disgraced for I find myself transmitting information not even through him, but through his students.[31]

Had he overheard a single comment from Anas he would have relayed it to others on his authority and not have pitied himself so. But thorough inspection of his biography has lead al-Mizzī and others to affirm that even though he saw him regularly, al-Aʿmash never gained a kernel of knowledge from him,[32] leaving us to conclude that the episode is either an outright fabrication or an error on the part of one of al-Aʿmash's pupils.[33] To

---

[29] Adh-Dhahabī, *Ṭabaqāt al-Qurrā'*, i:85.

[30] 'Abdus-Ṣabūr Shāhīn, *Tārīkh al-Qur'ān*, p. 88.

[31] See adh-Dhahabī, *Ṭabaqāt al-Qurrā'*, i:84.

[32] Al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl*, xii:76-92.

[33] This report can also be refuted logically. If true, the statement must have taken place between 61 A.H. (birth of al-Aʿmash) and 93 A.H. (death of Anas b. Mālik). Let us arbitrarily assume 75 A.H., with al-Aʿmash an adolescent of fourteen. Distributing his Muṣḥaf in 25 A.H., 'Uthmān gave stringent orders for the elimination of all earlier copies; no authenticated report has ever shown the Companions contradicting the 'Uthmāni Muṣḥaf. For Anas b. Mālik, a member of the Muṣḥaf committee, to make such a casual remark about such a weighty topic, at a time when the Muslim world had been united under a single text for fifty years, is untenable.

authenticate this or any incident, and arrive at an educated verdict, requires strict observance of *isnād* criticism.

5. The First Generations of Scholars

Before advancing any further, it is best to define the generational terms which were (and still are) used by Muslim scholars.

- The first generation, having accompanied the Prophet and known him personally, are of course 'Companions'. In the Sunnī school of thought all Companions are considered *ʿadl* (الصحابة عدول) because Allāh praised them without exception, vouching for their character in the Qur'ān repeatedly.
- The second generation, learning from the Companions, are called *tābiʿīn* (تابعين) or 'Successors'. Generally they belong to the first century of Hijra and up to the first quarter of the second century, and their transmissions are accepted provided they are found 'trustworthy'. No further checking is required since they are relaying statements from the Companions.
- The third generation, *atbāʿ at-tābiʿīn* (أتباع التابعين) or 'Succeeding Successors', extends mostly to the first half of the second century A.H. Unless the narrations of a third generation transmitter are verifiable through other sources, they will be branded *gharīb* (غريب: strange).
- Regardless of his repute, the statements of a fourth generation transmitter are rejected unless they are verifiable through independent means. Some of the people in this category have transmitted up to 200,000 *ḥadīths*, with barely two or three in their collections (if not less) lacking support through other *isnāds*. Ultimately a narrator from this generation is considered weak if many of his *ḥadīths* cannot be independently confirmed.[34]

Though recorded in the Prophet's lifetime it was not until a generation later, during the second half of the first century, that *ḥadīths* were categorized by subject into booklets. In the wake of these the second century saw works of an encyclopedic nature, including the *Muwaṭṭa'* of Mālik, *Muwaṭṭa'* of Shaibānī, *Āthār* of Abū Yūsuf, *Jāmiʿ* of Ibn Wahb, and *Kitāb* of Ibn Mājishūn. The third century finally heralded the arrival of voluminous tomes such as the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of al-Bukhārī and *Musnad* of Ibn Ḥanbal. The generational outline above imparts a rough idea of the valuation of *isnāds* and illustrates the tremendous difficulty, and implausibility, of a fabricated *ḥadīth* surviving unnoticed by the meticulous scholars who penned these works.

---

[34] See adh-Dhahabī, *al-Mūqiẓa*, pp. 77-78.

6. Preserving Books from Adulteration: A Unique System

To preserve them from the glosses and addendums of future scholars, a unique method was applied to these works which is still unparalleled in literary history. Based on the same concept as the transmission of *ḥadīth*, it entailed that any scholar relaying a collection of *ḥadīths* had to be in direct contact with the person he was transmitting from, since he was essentially bearing witness about him in written form. To use a book without hearing it from the author (or conversely, reading a copy to the author) made the culprit guilty of giving false evidence.

Bearing in mind the law of witness, the following modes were recognized for obtaining knowledge of *ḥadīth*. Each bore its own rank, some requiring more extensive contact than others and consequently receiving a superior status.

a) *Samā'* (سماع). In this a teacher reads to his students, and it includes the following sub-features: oral recitation, reading of texts, questions and answers, and dictation.
b) *'Arḍ* (عرض). Here the students read to the teacher.
c) *Munāwala* (مُناولة). To hand someone the text, allowing him to transmit that material without the involvement of any reading.
d) *Kitāba* (كتابة). A form of correspondence: the teacher sends *ḥadīths* in written form to other scholars.
e) *Waṣīyya* (وصيّة). Entrusting someone with a book of *ḥadīth*, which can then be transmitted on the original owner's authority.

During the first three centuries the first and second methods were most common, followed by *munāwala*, *kitāba*, and finally *waṣīyya*. Later periods witnessed three additional modes:

f) *Ijāza* (إجازة). Transmitting a *ḥadīth* or book on the authority of a scholar who grants permission expressly for this, without actually reading the book.
g) *I'lām* (إعلام). To inform someone about a particular book and its contents. (Most scholars did not concede this as a valid basis for transmitting *ḥadīths*.)
h) *Wijāda* (وجادة). This pertains to the discovery of texts (for example, old manuscripts) without having read them to the author or obtained consent for their transmission. Here the scholar must publicize that the book was found, and list its contents.

Each method enjoyed its own terminology, which served to disclose the mode of transmission to future scholars. The contents of *ḥadīth* books were to some degree shaped by this approach, as the transmitter's name became part of the text and any defects perceived in his character naturally affected the document's integrity.[35] Just as each *ḥadīth* integrated its own chain of narrators leading back to the Prophet or a Companion, so each book possessed its own chain of transmitters leading back to the author who originally compiled the work. This chain was mentioned either on the title page, at the start of the book, in both places, or perhaps as an amendment to each *ḥadīth*. Consider the following example.[36]

Figure 13.3: First page of Maghāzī Rasūlullāh by Wahb b. Munabbih (44-114 A.H.), copied in 227 A.H./841 C.E. Source: R.G. Khoury, Wahb b. Munabbih, *Plate PB1. Reprinted with the publisher's kind permission.*

---

[35] Refer back to *Nuskhat Abū az-Zubair b. 'Adī al-Kūfī*, the spurious copy mentioned in pp. 209 - 11.

[36] R.G. Khoury, *Wahb b. Munabbih*, Otto Harrassowitz - Wiesbaden, 1972, Band 1, Teil 2, Plate PB1. The date 227 A.H. appears in Plate GD1.

The first few lines read:[37]

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم حدثني محمد بن بحر أبو طلحة قال حدثنا عبد المنعم بن
ادريس عن أبيه عن أبي الياس عن وهب بن منبه قال لما تتابع المسلمون اقبالا إلى رسول
الله صلى الله عليه وسلم اقبل اسعد بن زرارة الى أبيه زرارة بن اسعد ...

This translates to:

> In the Name of Allāh, Most Gracious, Most Merciful. Muḥammad bin Baḥr Abū Ṭalḥa read to us, stating that ʿAbdul-Munʿim bin Idrīs read to us on the authority of his father, from Abū Ilyās, who narrated from Wahb bin Munabbih, who said, "When the delegations began approaching the Prophet to declare their embrace of Islam, Asʿad bin Zurāra went to his father Zurāra bin Asʿad ...".

Here the transmitters' names have become a permanent addendum to the very beginning of the text. This is also discerned in the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of al-Bukhārī and the *Sunan* of an-Nasā'ī for example, but it is by no means the only pattern. Certain works go further by inserting the original author's name at the start of every *ḥadīth* in the book, such as the *Muṣannaf* of ʿAbdur-Razzāq, *Muṣannaf* of Ibn Abī Shaiba, and (for the most part) *Sunan* of at-Tirmidhī. A third variety in fact cites the book's entire chain of transmitters at the beginning of each *ḥadīth*. Obviously with the passing of generations the inclusion of this entire chain will become prohibitively long, so occasionally only the author and the first few transmitters are inserted. Let us examine the *Muwaṭṭa'* of Mālik bin Anas according to the recension of Suwaid bin Saʿīd al-Ḥadathānī (*d.* 240 A.H.). The chain of transmission given at the *Muwaṭṭa'*'s beginning is (1) Thābit bin Bundār al-Baqqāl, from (2) ʿUmar bin Ibrāhīm az-Zuhrī, from (3) Muḥammad bin Gharieb, from (4) Aḥmad bin Muḥammad al-Washshā', from (5) Suwaid bin Saʿīd al-Ḥadathānī, from (6) Mālik bin Anas, the original author.

At the start of each *ḥadīth* lies an abbreviated version of this chain:

> Muḥammad read to us that Aḥmad related on the authority of Suwaid, who narrated from Mālik ...[38]

Following this is the *isnād* proper for that *ḥadīth*, culminating in the core text of the *ḥadīth* itself. Though this pattern is not uniformly observed across the wide array of manuscripts, the transmitters' names always gain inclusion into the text.

---

[37] *ibid*, p. 118.

[38] See any page in *Muwaṭṭa'* of Mālik, recension of Suwaid.

i. Conditions for Utilizing a Book

To teach or utilize a text, among the sternest requirements was for the scholar to adhere exclusively to the copy which bore his name in the reading certificate. This certificate was his license, proof that he had attended the relevant lectures wherein his teacher relayed that manuscript.[39] While free to make a duplicate of his teacher's book or to employ the book of a higher authority along the same chain, the use of all other copies was strictly forbidden. Suppose ***A*** is the original author, and his book is spread through the following channels.

Figure 13.4: ***A****, the original author has* ***L****,* ***H*** *and* ***G*** *as students.*

Despite all these copies originating from ***A***, we find that ***M*** is not entitled to use the copy of ***R*** or ***N***, or of ***H*** or ***L***. Instead he must limit himself to the copies of ***G***, ***M*** or ***A***; attempting to break out of this restriction will bring disgrace. Additionally, after scribing a copy for himself he must go through the original text and make corrections as necessary, and should he decide to use it without the benefit of a thorough revision then he must make this clear, or else risk soiling his name.

ii. Glosses: the Addition of External Material

Students possessing their own copies occasionally appended material to the fixed text to clarify an obscure word, provide fresh evidence not quoted by the original author, or some such thing. Because these extra items were marked off by a completely different *isnād*, or at the least the inserter's name, there was no danger of spoiling the text. A very clear instance is reproduced in one of my works,[40] wherein the copyist added two lines before completing the sentence. Other examples include the placing of two lines into *al-Muḥabbar*

---

[39] For details refer to pp. 220 - 21.

[40] Al-Aʿẓamī, *Studies in Early Hadith Literature*, appendix 4.

(المحبر) by Abū Saʿīd,[41] and extra material supplied by al-Firabrī in the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of al-Bukhārī.[42] In both cases the new *isnād* is readily discernible.

Running contrary to the example of first and second century C.E. Christian scribes who altered their texts if they believed themselves inspired,[43] or to Jewish scribes who inserted changes in the interest of doctrine,[44] interpolations were never tolerated in the Islamic framework; every instance of personal commentary required the student's signature and perhaps even a fresh *isnād*. Adherence to these rules insured that such glosses did not invalidate the text since the source of the new material was always made clear.

iii. Establishing Authorship

When confronted with a manuscript, the fingers that scribed it now long deceased, how do we establish that the contents really do belong to the supposed author? Just as an elaborate system of checks must validate each *ḥadīth*, so the same roughly applies to every compilation of *ḥadīths*. Below is a manuscript's title page, followed by a summarized translation.

> *Kitāb al-Ashriba* [the book of various drinks] by *Abū ʿAbdullāh Aḥmad bin Muḥammad bin Ḥanbal*, read to *Abū al-Qāsim ʿAbdullāh bin Muḥammad bin ʿAbdul-ʿAzīz al-Baghawī ibn bint Aḥmad bin Manīʿ*.

[Second Page:]

> In the Name of Allāh, Most Gracious, Most Merciful. Beginning of *Kitāb al-Ashriba. Abū al-Qāsim ʿAbdullāh bin Muḥammad bin ʿAbdul-ʿAzīz al-Baghawī ibn bint Aḥmad bin Manīʿ al-Baghdādī* read to us in Baghdad, stating that *Abū ʿAbdullāh Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal* read to him in the year 228 from his book....

The normal procedure for establishing this work's authenticity is:

a. To examine the original author's biography (Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal), much of which will undoubtedly stem from his contemporaries. The focus of our search is two-fold. First, to uncover whether Ibn Ḥanbal ever authored a book titled *Kitāb al-Ashriba*; second, to organize a list of all his pupils and determine if Abū al-Qāsim ibn bint Aḥmad

---

[41] Ibn Ḥabīb, *al-Muḥabbar*, p. 122.

[42] Al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, i:407; ii:107. For other examples see Abū Dāwūd, *Sunan*, *ḥadīth* no. 2386; Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, Ṣalāt:63, p. 304.

[43] P.W. Comfort, *Early Manuscripts & Modern Translations of the New Testament*, p. 6.

[44] E. Würthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament*, 2nd Edition, W.B. Eerdmans Pu - lishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1995, p. 17.

Figure 13.5: Kitāb al-Ashriba. Contains a reading note from 332 A.H./943 C.E. Source: Library of Asad, Damascus.

bin Manīʿ was ever among them. Assuming that both enquiries are positive we proceed to:

b. Here we analyze the biography of Abū al-Qāsim ibn bint Aḥmad bin Manīʿ, again with a two-fold purpose. First to establish whether he is trustworthy, and thereafter to compile a list of all *his* pupils.

c. And so on, examining the biographies of every link in the chain.

Should our research conclude that Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal had authored a work by this title, that every element in the chain is trustworthy, and that the chain is unbroken, only then can we authoritatively confirm the book's authorship. Naturally some manuscripts are not so clear cut and occasion much perplexity. Such a topic is beyond the scope of this basic introduction, however, and for those interested I advise looking into any work on the science of *Muṣṭalaḥ al-Ḥadīth* (مصطلح الحديث).[45]

---

[45] Such as Ibn Ṣalāḥ, *al-Muqaddima fī ʿUlūm al-Ḥadīth*; ar-Rāmahurmuzī, *al-Muḥadith al-Fāṣil*; Ibn Ḥajar, *Nuzhat an-Naẓar Sharḥ Nukhbat al-Fikr fī Muṣṭalaḥi Ahl al-Athar*.

7. Certificates of Reading

As discussed previously, scholars faced stringent limitations on which books they were free to use in the form of a 'license' or reading certificate. In promulgating *ḥadīth* books a regular attendance record was always kept, written either by the teacher or one of the famous scholars present, and this furnished exact details of attendance such as who had listened to the entire book, who joined in partially and which portions they missed, the women and children (and even the maids and servants) who participated, and the dates and sites of these readings. Any attendee younger than five was listed with his age and the designation *haḍar* (حضر: attended); if older he was mentioned as a regular student. A signature at the book's conclusion terminated this reading certificate, indicating that no further entries could be made therein.[46] To the *muḥaddithīn* this certificate was *ṭibāq* (طباق), an exclusive license for those listed within to read, teach, copy, or quote from that book.

In this manuscript dated 276 A.H. the reading certificate contains sundry information. Note that the attendees have now become a permanent addendum to the very title of the work.

Figure 13.6: Jāmi' of Ibn Wahb, with a reading certificate from 276 A.H.
Source: The Egyptian Library, Cairo.

---

[46] There were various means of issuing these certificates, which consisted mostly of essential and necessary details, though the sequence of information was up to the writer's discretion.

From the certificate we can extract the following:

Teacher:	Abū Isḥāq Ibrāhīm bin Mūsā
Title of book:	*Kitāb aṣ-Ṣamt*
Participants:	'Alī bin Yaḥyā
	'Abdullāh bin Yūsuf
	Muḥammad bin Ismā'īl
	Sulaimān bin al-Ḥasan
	Naṣr, client of 'Abdullāh...
	Asbāṭ bin Ja'far
	Lakhm, client of Ṣāliḥ
	Ḥasan bin Miskin bin Shu'ba
	Aḥmad bin Isḥāq
	Ḥātim bin Ya'qūb
	'Abdul-'Azīz bin Muḥammad
	'Alī bin Maslama
	Muḥammad bin Muṭayyib
	al-Ḥasan bin Muḥammad bin Ṣāliḥ
City:	Asna
Date:	Rabī' al-Awwal 276 A.H.
Pedigree:	"I copied these two volumes from the book of Abū Isḥāq Ibrāhīm bin Mūsā."[47]
Original author:	['Abdullāh b. Wahb]

The book begins:

> This is *Kitāb aṣ-Ṣamt*, part of the *Jāmi' of Ibn Wahb*. In the Name of Allāh, Most Gracious, Most Merciful. [The chapter about] speaking when a matter should not be spoken of, and when it does no good [to speak of it]. Abū Isḥāq informed us that Ḥarmala bin Yaḥyā stated that 'Abdullāh bin Wahb told him....[48]

i. The Importance of Reading Notes

Meant to safeguard *ḥadīth* compilations from distortion, these certificates now provide the contemporary scholar with a sea of valuable facts. One can trace a book's proliferation through these notes far better than by relying solely on bibliographical data, as I will show in the next few pages.

---

[47] J. David-Weill (ed.), *Le Djâmi' d'Ibn Wahb*, Imprimerie De L'Institut Français D'Archéologie Orientale, Cairo, 1939, p. 77. I have arranged the information in this fashion for illustrative purposes.

[48] *ibid*, p. 40.

A. MINGANA, ROBSON, AND THE TRANSMISSION OF ḤADĪTH ANTHOLOGIES

Rev. Mingana published a work on the diffusion of the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of al-Bukhārī, while James Robson worked on the transmissions of the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of Muslim, *Sunan* of Abū Dāwūd, *Sunan* of at-Tirmidhī, *Sunan* of an-Nasā'ī, and *Sunan* of Ibn Mājah. Though both works are riddled with grievous misconceptions I will cast aside my comments for the time being, and suffice by copying Robson's diagram for the transmission of *Sunan Ibn Mājah.*[49]

Ibn Mājah
Qaṭṭān
Abū Ṭalḥa
Muqawwimī
Abū Zur'a
'Abd al-Laṭīf al-Bagdādī
'Abdallāh b. Aḥmad b. Qudāma
Ibn Bāqā
Farrā'
Umar b. Muḥammad Ibn 'Alawān
Sanqat
'Abd al-Rahmān b. Abū 'Umar
Ismā'īl b. Ismā'īl
'Abd al-Ḥāliq
Ibn 'Alawān
'Aṭṭār
Ibn al-Šam'a'
Hamadānī
Dahabī
Mizzī
Dāwūd b. Ibrāhīm
Muḥammad b. Ismā'īl
Ibn Nubāta
Tanūḫī
Raqqī
Lu'lu'ī
Ibn Ḥajar

Figure 13.7: Robson's diagram for the transmission of Ibn Mājah

A more promising diagram comes from Isḥāq Khān in *al-Uṣūl as-Sitta wa Ruwātuhā,*[50] though it still fails to convey the full scope of transmission. Here is the diagram relating to Ibn Qudāma only (the original is in Arabic):

Taken together, these two charts insinuate that less than a dozen students transmitted *Sunan Ibn Mājah* through the renowned Ibn Qudāma. Such a miserly perception can be dispelled, I believe, if we examine the manuscript of at-Taimūria, no. 522 at the Egyptian Public Library, Cairo.

---

[49] J. Robson, "The Transmission of Ibn Maga's Sunan", *Journal of Semitic Studies,* vol. 3 (1958), pp. 129-41. Only the portion relating to Ibn Qudāma is shown.

[50] M.A. Thesis, College of Education, King Saud University, Riyāḍ, 1405 (1985), p. 323.

Ibn Mājah
Al-Qaṭṭān
Abū Ṭalḥa
Al-Muqawwimī
Abū Zur'a
Ibn Qudāma
Abū Isḥāq
Al-Farrā
Adh-Dhahabī
Shamsuddīn
At-Tujaibī
Al-Bhagdādī
Al-Ḥarrānī
Al-Mizzī
Ibānī
Ibn Ḥajar

Figure 13.8: Khān's diagram for the transmission of Ibn Mājah, as pertains to Ibn Qudāma only.

B. READING CERTIFICATES IN SUNAN IBN MĀJAH

Ibn Qudāma al-Maqdisī (*d.* 620 A.H.), author of one of the most celebrated encyclopedic books on Islamic jurisprudence, *al-Mughnī* (printed in fourteen volumes), served as the scribe of this valuable manuscript. Dividing it into seventeen parts, he placed blank sheets after each part to provide sufficient space for reading certificates,[51] which he copied with abridgement at each part's conclusion while noting that the full certificate was written by the hand of another famous scholar, Ibn Ṭāriq (*d.* 592 A.H.). The certificates for the sixth part, for example, show that this portion was read by ʿAbdullāh bin Aḥmad bin Aḥmad bin Aḥmad bin al-Khashshāb, to Sheikh Abū Zurʿa Ṭāhir bin Muḥammad bin Ṭāhir al-Maqdisī. Those in attendance included ʿAbdullāh bin ʿAlī bin M. M. al-Farrā, Dulāf, Abū Huraira, Ibn Qudāma, ʿAbdul-Ghanī, Aḥmad bin Ṭāriq, *etc.* Tuesday, 19 Rabīʿ al-Ākhir, 561 A.H.

By copying this, even with abridgement, Ibn Qudāma al-Maqdisī establishes two points:

1. That he has the authority to use this manuscript for the purposes of teaching and quotation, since he learned it through the proper channels.

---

[51] Generally all such divisions were left to the scribe's discretion: he could drop the divisions altogether, or devise his own scheme.

2. That this copy of *Ibn Mājah* is a duplicate of the same original that was read to his teacher, so he is not violating any rules of transmission.

Below I have provided a summary of the notes for the sixth part; as the manuscript's binding is no longer in fair condition the pages have been shuffled and out of order for some time, meaning that a few pages may be misplaced or missing. I verified that no sheets from other parts entered this portion, since pages often cite which part they belong to in their reading notes.[52]

Reading Note No.	Name of Teacher	Name of Reader	Scribe Writing the Certificate	Date of Reading	Approx. attendance
1	Describes Ibn Qudāma's authority to use *Sunan Ibn Mājah*				
2	ʻAbdullāh bin Aḥmad al-Maqdisī (Ibn Qudāma)	ʻUbaidullāh bin ʻAbdul-Ghanī	ʻUbaidullāh bin ʻAbdul-Ghanī	15 Shawwāl, 604 A.H.	30
3	Ibn Qudāma al-Maqdisī	Muḥammad bin Aḥmad	(illegible)	Tuesday, 12 Ramaḍān, 569	32
4	ʻAbdul-Qādir ar-Rahāwī	Muḥammad bin Qāsim bin al-Ḥasan	Maḥmūd bin Ayyoub as-Suharwardī	Sunday Rabīʻ-II, 596	21
5	Ibn Qudāma	ʻAbdur-Razzāq	*(illegible)*	*(illegible)*	*(illegible)*
6	Ibn Qudāma	Yūsuf bin Khalīl ad-Dimashqī	Ibrāhīm bin ʻAbdullāh, client of ʻAbdān bin Naṣr al-Bazzāz ad-Dimashqī	Thursday, 8 Dhūl-Qiʻda, 600	33
7	Ibn Qudāma	Maḥfūẓ bin ʻĪsā	Maḥfūẓ bin ʻĪsā	Sunday, 12 Dhūl-Qiʻda, 600	1
8	Ibn Qudāma	Yaḥyā bin ʻAlī al-Māliqī	Ṣāliḥ bin Abū Bakr	...[5]77 A.H.	20
9	*Teachers:* (a) Ibn ash-Shiḥna — Anjāb — Abū Zurʻa (b) Sittil Fuqahā' — Anjāb, Ibn Qabīṭī, and al-Hashimī — Abū Zurʻa (c) Ibn aṣ-Ṣā'igh — ar-Rikābī — as-Suharwardī — Abū Zurʻa (d) Ibn al-Muhandis — Baʻlabakkī — Ibn al-Ustādh — Muwaffaq — Abū Zurʻa (e) Ibn al-Muhandis — Baʻlabakkī — Ibn Qudāma — Abū Zurʻa (f) An-Nawwās — Ibn al-Baghdādī — Ibn Qudāma — Abū Zurʻa (g) An-Nawwās — Ibn al-Baghdādī — ar-Rahāwī — Abū Zurʻa *Reader and Scribe:* Ibn aṣ-Ṣairafī *Date:* 10-11-725 A.H.					50
10	*Teachers:* (a) ʻAbdur-Raḥmān bin Muḥammad bin Qudāma (b) Ibrāhīm bin ʻAbdullāh (c) Muḥammad bin ʻAbdur-Raḥīm (d) Aḥmad bin Aḥmad bin ʻUbaidullāh *Scribe:* ʻAbdul-Ḥāfiẓ al-Maqdisī *Date:* 17-10-659 A.H.					100
11	Maḥmūd bin ʻAbdullāh ar-Raiḥānī — as-Suharwardī — Abū Zurʻa	Ibrāhīm bin Yaḥyā bin Aḥmad	Ibrāhīm bin Yaḥyā bin Aḥmad	Tuesday, 11-5-665 A.H.	20
12	Maḥmūd bin ʻAbdullāh ar-Raiḥānī	ʻAlī bin Masʻūd bin Nafīs al-Mauṣilī	ʻAlī bin ʻAbdul-Kāfī	*(Washed away)*	12
13	*Teachers:* (a) Al-Bālisī — Um ʻAbdullāh (b) Al-Ḥarrānī — Ibn ʻAlwān — ʻAbdul-Laṭīf al-Baghdādī (c) Ibrāhīm bin Buḥair — Ibn ʻAlwān (d) Ibn Sulṭān al-Maqdisī — Zainab bint Kamāl — Abū Zurʻa (e) Khālid Sanqar — al-Baghdādī — Abū Zurʻa (f) Ibn Sulṭān al-Maqdisī — an-Nābulsī — Ibn Qudāma and ʻAbdul-Laṭīf — Abū Zurʻa *Reader and Scribe:* Muḥammad al-Qaisī ad-Dimashqī *Date:* Tuesday, 2-11-798 A.H.					35
14	ʻAbdur-Raḥmān bin Muḥammad — Ibn Qudāma	*(Washed away)*	*(Washed away)*	Wednesday, 15-7-678 A.H.	40
15	Sittil Fuqahā'— Ibn al-Qabīṭī — Abū Zurʻa	ʻAbdul-ʻAzīz bin Muḥammad al-Kaltānī	ʻAbdul-ʻAzīz bin Muḥammad al-Kaltānī	Wednesday, 19-8-625 A.H.	20

From this table we can extract that a total of 115 students studied part six of this text directly from Ibn Qudāma; those learning it through his students in turn number roughly 450. Of the many manuscripts of *Sunan Ibn Mājah* in circulation at the time, there were most likely others which listed Ibn Qudāma's name in their reading certificates—manuscripts which have yet to be discovered or which have been lost to us forever. The reams of information bristling within this one certificate demonstrate that all transmission diagrams drawn till now, whether for *Ibn Mājah* or any other work, are so meager that we cannot even call them rudimentary without embarrassing ourselves.

---

[52] The original reading notes contain much detail, pertaining to the method of transmission used (e.g *ijāza* or *samā'*), and in some cases whether only a portion of the text was read. Here I have sufficed with a simple outline of all the transmission chains.

8. Impact of Ḥadīth Methodology on Other Branches

So powerful was this methodology, so well did it prove itself, that it quickly spilled beyond the confines of *ḥadīth* literature to include almost all literary and scholarly works:

- For examples in tafsīr, see the *Tafsīrs* of ʿAbdur-Razzāq (*d.* 211 A.H.) and Sufyān ath-Thaurī (*d.* 161 A.H.).
- For history, see the *Tārīkh* of Khalīfa bin Khayyāṭ (*d.* 240 A.H.).
- For law, see the *Muwaṭṭa'* of Imām Mālik (*d.* 179 A.H.).
- For literature and folklore, see *al-Bayān wa at-Tabyīn* by al-Jāḥiẓ (150-255 A.H.), and *al-Aghānī* by al-Aṣfahānī (*d.* 356 A.H.). This latter occupies twenty volumes and relates the stories of composers, poets, and singers (both men and women), along with a hearty sprinkling of their vulgar anecdotes. Interestingly one finds that even these indelicate tales have been cited through proper *isnād* channels, and that if the author appropriates material from a book for which he does not have an apt license he states clearly, "I copied this from the book of so and so".

9. Isnād and the Transmission of the Qur'ān

All these studies raise an essential question. When this disciplined methodology served as an everyday workhorse for transmitting information, everything from the *sunna* to the love lives of singers, why was it not also applied to the Qur'ān?

Answering this entails that we recall the nature of this Holy Book. As it is the Word of Allāh and a vital element of all prayers, its usage is far more ubiquitous than the *sunna*. The need to use transmission chains and reading certificates for everyone setting out to learn the Qur'ān was therefore superseded. Individuals wishing to learn the *art* of professional recitation, of keeping in practice the sounds and *makhārij* (المخارج: inflections) used by famous reciters, did possess certificates and unbroken chains leading back to the Prophet. Abū al-ʿAlā' al-Hamadhānī al-ʿAṭṭār (488-569 A.H./1095-1173 C.E.), a well-known scholar, compiled a biography of reciters entitled *al-Intiṣār fī Maʿrifat Qurrā' al-Mudun wa al-Amṣār*. This twenty-volume work has long perished unfortunately. But we can still reap a few grains of information from what others have written about it: for example, that the author's full list of his teachers and their teachers, on a path converging back to the Prophet, covered pages 7-162.[53] All these were professional reciters. Any attempt to extend this sketch and include non-professionals would be a hopeless task indeed. Even the speed with which the Qur'ān spread is difficult to fathom. To appease his curiosity about the number of pupils studying the Book in his Damascus circle, Abū ad-Dardā' (*d.* circa 35 A.H./655 C.E.) requested Muslim bin Mishkām to count for him; the final tally exceeded 1600. Attending Abū ad-Dardā''s circle in successive turns after *fajr* prayer they would listen to his recitation then emulate him, reciting amongst themselves for practice.[54]

Conceding the involvement of two different methodologies in the spread of the Qur'ān versus the *sunna*, there are nevertheless a few points common to the transmission of both:

1. *Knowledge requires direct contact, and exclusive reliance on books is prohibited.* Simply owning a Muṣḥaf can never displace the necessity of learning how to recite from a knowledgeable instructor.
2. *A stringent standard of morality is demanded of all teachers.* If an individual's peers know him to be of questionable habits, no one will seek his tutelage.
3. *Sketching transmission diagrams using bibliographical data alone does not provide a full view of the subject's immensity.* To outline the Qur'ān's diffusion, as we did with the sixth part of one manuscript of *Sunan Ibn Mājah*, would require a registry of every Muslim who has walked this earth from the dawn of Islam to our present day.

10. Conclusion

Recourse to a recognized instructor, inspection of biographies to uncover personal character, legitimacy as established through reading certificates, and other facets of this methodology united to form a powerful barrier against distortion in the books of *sunna*. But with the exception of professional reciters, the one field not subjected to vigorous *isnāds* was the transmission of the Qur'ān, for in this sole area was textual corruption impossible. That the exact same words echoed from every mosque, school, house and bazaar throughout all corners of the Muslim nation was a greater safeguard against corruption than anything any human system could have promised.

---

[53] Al-Hamadhānī, *Ghāyat al-Ikhtiṣār*, i:7-162.

[54] Adh-Dhahabī, *Seyr*, ii:346.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

THE SO-CALLED MUṢḤAF OF IBN MASʿŪD

As mentioned earlier, Arthur Jeffery examined 170 volumes to compile a list of variant readings which take up roughly 300 pages in printed form, covering the so-called personal Muṣḥafs of nearly thirty scholars. Of this total he reserves 88 pages for the variations allegedly coming from Ibn Masʿūd's Muṣḥaf alone, with another 65 pages for Ubayy's Muṣḥaf, dividing the remainder (140 pages) between the other twenty-eight. The disproportionately high variance rate attributed to Ibn Masʿūd makes his Muṣḥaf worthy of closer inspection; some of the claims raised by Jeffery against it are:

- That it differs from the ʿUthmāni Muṣḥaf in its sūra arrangement,
- And in its text,
- And that it omits three sūras.

He levies all these charges even though no one, including his sources, has ever witnessed a copy bearing all these alleged variances. In truth none of his references even mentions a 'Muṣḥaf of Ibn Masʿūd'; instead they use the word *qara'a* (قرأ: read), in the context of "Ibn Masʿūd recited such-and-such verse in this way". A cursory glance at his sources yields two objections straightaway. First, because they never state that Ibn Masʿūd was reading from a written copy we can just as easily assume that he was overheard reciting from memory, and how can we confidently deduce that the erroneous readings were not due to a memory slip? Second (and this is a point I made earlier), the vast majority of Jeffery's references contain no *isnād* whatsoever, making them inadmissible because they offer nothing but empty gossip.

Comparing a Muṣḥaf attributed to any scholar with ʿUthmān's Muṣḥaf is utterly meaningless unless we can show that both are of equal status, proving the authenticity of the former to the same degree of certainty that we have for the latter. The contents of a Muṣḥaf, just like a *ḥadīth* or *qirā'at*, can be reported in such a way that scholars find it:

1. Authentic with absolute certainty, or
2. Doubtful, or
3. Absolutely false (whether due to inadvertent or deliberate errors).

Suppose that many well-known students of Ibn Masʿūd (such as al-Aswad, Masrūq, ash-Shaibānī, Abū Wā'il, al-Hamadānī, ʿAlqama, Zirr and others) report a statement unanimously; in this case their attribution of this statement to Ibn Masʿūd is considered valid and admissible. If the overwhelming majority are agreed while one or two well-known students report to the contrary, then the minority account is termed 'doubtful'. And should this minority group contain only weak or unknown pupils, contradicting the consensus of those who are renowned, then this falls into the third category of absolute falsehood.

In the course of collating manuscripts 'equal status' becomes a vital concept. If we uncover a document penned in the original author's hand, then the scholarly value of duplicate copies belonging to his most famous students (let alone a mysterious student) plummets to nil. To do otherwise and confer equal value to both the original and the duplicate, is completely unscientific.[1] With this in mind let us approach Jeffery's allegations.

1. First Point: The Arrangement of Ibn Masʿūd's Muṣḥaf

While none of Ibn Masʿūd's peers mentions a Muṣḥaf of his bearing a different sūra arrangement, quite a few such Muṣḥafs seem to have sprung up after his death. An-Nadīm quotes al-Faḍl bin Shādhān, "I found the sūra arrangement in Ibn Masʿūd's Muṣḥaf as follows: *al-Baqara, an-Nisā', Āli-ʿImrān* .... [*i.e.* no *al-Fātiḥa*]".[2] Following this with his own commentary, an-Nadīm says that he has personally seen numerous Muṣḥafs ascribed to Ibn Masʿūd but has been unable to find any two in agreement with each other, adding that he has also come across one copied during the second century of Hijra which includes *Sūra al-Fātiḥa*. But because al-Faḍl bin Shādhān is reckoned a leading authority on this subject, an-Nadīm decides to quote him rather than accentuate his own observations.[3] An-Nadīm's commentary proves that those who claim a discrepancy in Ibn Masʿūd's Muṣḥaf cannot, with even the minutest degree of certainty, state what the actual arrangement was.

A significant number of famous students studied *Sharīʿa* (Islamic law and jurisprudence) under Ibn Masʿūd and transmitted the Qur'ān from him. Regarding his Muṣḥaf we find two conflicting reports: in one the arrangement of sūras is different from ours, while in the other it is exactly identical. The former report fails to arrive at any collective agreement about the sequence of sūras however, and is greatly overshadowed by the sureness

---

[1] This has been discussed earlier, see pp. 87 - 89.

[2] An-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, p. 29.

[3] *ibid*, p. 29.

of the latter. Clearly this more concrete version is the one that warrants our consideration. Al-Quraẓī recounts seeing the Muṣḥafs used by Ibn Masʿūd, Ubayy and Zaid b. Thābit, and finding among them no differences.[4]

By consensus, professional reciters follow the vocal inflections of any of the seven most distinguished reciters (القرّاء): ʿUthmān, ʿAlī, Zaid b. Thābit, Ubayy, Abū Mūsā al-Ashʿarī, Abū ad-Dardā' and Ibn Masʿūd. Transmission chains for these recitations continue unbroken back to the Prophet, and the sūra arrangement in each is identical to that of the existing Qur'ān. We must also recall that, even if we were to give any credence to the aberrant accounts, differences in sūra arrangement do not affect the contents of the Qur'ān in any way.[5]

Having memorized most of the Book directly from the Prophet, Ibn Masʿūd was critical and furious for being excluded from the committee which prepared the ʿUthmāni Muṣḥaf, resorting to some harsh remarks which the Companions found distasteful. Afterwards, his anger spent, he may have expressed remorse for his hasty comments and rearranged the sūras in his Muṣḥaf to reflect the ʿUthmāni sequence. This might be the origin of both reports, that his sequence was similar and dissimilar to ʿUthmān's, though the truth is best known to Allāh. The divergent nature of the many 'Muṣḥafs of Ibn Masʿūd' that materialized after his death, with no two in agreement, shows that the wholesale ascription of these to him is erroneous, and the scholars who did so neglected to examine their sources well. Sadly the less scrupulous among antique dealers found it profitable, for the weight of a few silver pieces, to add fake Muṣḥafs of Ibn Masʿūd or Ubayy to their wares.[6]

2. Second Point: The Text Differed from the ʿUthmāni Muṣḥaf

I asserted above the need for some kind of certitude about Ibn Masʿūd's Muṣḥaf. While researching variant readings, Abū Ḥayyān an-Naḥawī noticed that most of the reports were channeled through Shiite sources; Sunnī scholars on the other hand stated that Ibn Masʿūd's readings were in line with the rest of the Muslim *umma*.[7] What has trickled through to us via isolated sources cannot supersede what is known with certainty. In pages 57-73 of *Kitāb al-Maṣāḥif* (edited by Jeffery), under the chapter of "Muṣḥaf of ʿAbdullāh b. Masʿūd", we find a horde of variants all stemming from al-

---

[4] A. Jeffery (ed.), *Muqaddimatān*, p. 47.

[5] See pp. 77 - 78.

[6] See A. Jeffery (ed.), *Muqaddimatān*, pp. 47-48.

[7] Abū Ḥayyān an-Naḥawī, *Tafsīr Baḥr al-Muḥīṭ*, i:161.

Aʿmash (*d.* 148 A.H.). Not only does al-Aʿmash fail to furnish any references for this—hardly surprising given his proclivity for *tadlīs* (تدليس: concealing the source of information)—he is moreover accused of Shiite tendencies.[8] Many other examples lend further support to an-Naḥawī's inference of a Shiite connection. In his book Jeffery attributes the following reading to Ubayy and Ibn Masʿūd (there is no reference):

> والسابقون بالإيمان بالنبي عليه السلام فهم عليّ وذريته الذين اصطفاهم الله من أصحابه
> وجعلهم الموالي على غيرهم. أولئك هم الفائزونَ الذين يرثون الفردوس هم فيها خالدون.[9]
>
> And the foremost to believe in the Prophet, peace be upon him, are ʿAlī and his descendents whom Allāh has chosen from among his Companions, appointing them viceroys over all others. They are the winners who shall inherit the Gardens, residing therein forever.

While in the Qurʾān it is: والسابقون السابقون أولئك المقربون ("*And the foremost will be [those who in life were] the foremost [in faith and good deeds]; they will be the ones drawn closest [to Allāh]*").[10] Such a glowing tribute to ʿAlī's descendants undoubtedly served the Shiite cause.[11]

Embarking on any research requires a solid footing, whereas here we discover ourselves drowning in a sea of hearsay that carries almost no transmission chains and that fails to provide any coherent view of what 'Ibn Masʿūd's Muṣḥaf' might have been. Under the circumstances Jeffery's approach and findings, we can see, are fundamentally flawed.

3. Third Point: Three Sūras were Omitted

The first and the last two sūras (*Sūra al-Fātiḥa*, *al-Falaq* and *an-Nās*) were, according to some accounts, absent from the Muṣḥaf of Ibn Masʿūd.[12] The

---

[8] For details see al-Mizzī, *Tahdhīb*, xi:87-92.

[9] A. Jeffery, *Materials*, p. 97.

[10] Qurʾān 56:10-11.

[11] Until recently Shiite theologians had tended to cast doubt on aspects of the Qurʾān, for the simple reason that the Qurʾān was first collected by Abū Bakr, then copied and distributed by ʿUthmān and not ʿAlī. The strange thing is that ʿAlī himself stuck to the same Muṣḥaf, *i.e.* the Muṣḥaf of ʿUthmān, and never brought forth a new edition. Recently however a new and healthier trend has been emerging. A few years ago in a conference in Tehran, Iran, Shiite authorities announced that they did not possess any Muṣḥaf besides that of ʿUthmān, and that it is pure and free of any corruption. As a matter of fact one does not find a Muṣḥaf printed in Iran, or manuscripts of the Qurʾān in Najaf, Qum, Mashhad *etc.*, which differ from the common Muṣḥaf found in any other part of the world.

[12] As-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān*, i:220-21. These are sūras no. 1, 113 and 114 respectively.

whole case seems dubious. Jeffery begins his book with the alleged variants from *Sūra al-Fātiḥa*: أرشدنا instead of أهدنا, and مَن instead of الذين.[13] Elsewhere he argues that this sūra was never present, so then where exactly did he get his variants? The reader may recall an-Nadīm's earlier comment, that he happened upon a Muṣḥaf attributed to Ibn Masʿūd which contained *Sūra al-Fātiḥa*. Bear in mind also that *al-Fātiḥa* is unquestionably the most recited sūra in the Qurʾān, an integral part of every *rakʿa* (ركعة) within each prayer. In the audible prayers alone it echoes from mosques six times a day and eight times on Fridays. Any claims of a variant recitation for *al-Fātiḥa* cannot be taken seriously, based on pure logic and the sheer repetition of this sūra on every Muslim ear and tongue since the time of the Prophet.[14]

Anyone with a penchant for copying certain sūras and not others is free to do so. Even the scribbling of extra information in the margins is permitted, so long as it is kept separate from the holy text. Such occurrences cannot be taken as an argument against the Qurʾān's integrity. That the ʿUthmāni Muṣḥaf contains the unadulterated Words of Allāh as sectioned into 114 sūrahs, is the firm belief of the Muslim *umma*; anyone eschewing this view is an outcast. Had Ibn Masʿūd denied these three sūras their rightful status then his fate would have been no different.

Al-Bāqillānī arrives at a comprehensive and highly compelling argument against these reports. He observes that anyone denying a particular sūra as part of the Qurʾān is either an apostate or a *fāsiq* (فاسق: a dissolute person who flaunts his sins), and so one of the two must apply to Ibn Masʿūd if the accounts are indeed true. In several *ḥadīths* the Prophet praised him and lauded his piety however, which is inconceivable had he harbored such deviance. Ibn Masʿūd's peers were also under obligation, if they knew anything sacrilegious about his beliefs, to expose him as a deviant or apostate because failure to do so would lead to their own censure. But his contemporaries praised his scholarship unanimously without a single dissenting voice. In al-Bāqillānī's mind this can only mean one of two possibilities: either Ibn Masʿūd never denied the rightful status of any sūra, or that his scholarly peers and all who knew him are guilty of covering up his blasphemy and deserve denunciation *en masse.*[15]

---

[13] A. Jeffery, *Materials*, p. 25.

[14] Today nearly half a million people participate in the *tarāwīḥ* (تراويح) prayers in Makkah during the month of Ramaḍān (and in some nights, especially the 27th, in excess of one million). [See the Saudi daily, Ar-Riyāḍ, 1 Jan 2000.] Only the best among the *ḥuffāẓ* are chosen to lead this massive congregation. With modern technology we can instantaneously watch these proceedings, and we find that if even the most renowned ḥāfiẓ commits an error, the people behind him correct him immediately. A congregation will never allow an error to pass uncorrected, irrespective of the imām's reputation or greatness. This gives us a measure of the community's sensitivity towards the Book of Allāh.

i. Analysis of the Contents of Ibn Masʿūd's Muṣḥaf

Reports concerning the omission of these sūras can be listed as follows (the transmission chain precedes each narration).

1. ʿĀṣim – Zirr (one of Ibn Masʿūd's students) – Ibn Masʿūd: a narration claiming that he did not write two sūras (nos. 113 and 114) in his Muṣḥaf.[16]
2. Al-Aʿmash – Abū Isḥāq – ʿAbdur-Raḥmān b. Yazīd: Ibn Masʿūd erased the *muʿawwadhatain* (المعوذتين: Sūras 113 and 114) from his Maṣāḥif (plural) and said that they were not part of the Qur'ān.[17]
3. Ibn ʿUyayna – ʿAbdah and ʿĀṣim – Zirr: "I told Ubayy, 'Your brother erases Sūras 113 and 114 from the Muṣḥaf', to which he did not object." Asked whether the reference was to Ibn Masʿūd, Ibn ʿUyayna replied in the affirmative and added that the two sūras were not in his Muṣḥaf because he believed them to be invocations of divine protection, used by the Prophet on his grandsons al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusain. Ibn Masʿūd remained adamant of his opinion, while others were sure about them and kept them in the Qur'ān.[18]

So in the second and third report Ibn Masʿūd was deleting sūras that had somehow found their way into his Muṣḥaf; why then had he penned them down in the first place? It makes no sense. If we suppose that the Muṣḥaf had been scribed for him and initially contained the two concluding sūras, then they must necessarily have been an integral part of the Muṣḥaf which was then in circulation. Had he any doubts about the two sūras, it was his duty to verify this issue with the scholars of Madinah and elsewhere. In one *fatwā* (فتوى: legislative ruling) he declared that a man marrying a woman but divorcing her prior to any consummation was free to then wed her mother. Visiting Madinah and discussing the matter further, he discovered that he had erred and rescinded the *fatwā*; his first errand upon returning to Kūfa was to visit the person who had solicited his opinion and tell him of his mistake. Such was his attitude in the academic sphere, and how much more pressing are issues touching the Qur'ān. All reasonable evidence indicates

---

[15] Al-Bāqillānī, *al-Intiṣār*, pp. 190-91.

[16] Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, v:129, *ḥadīth* nos. 21224-25.

[17] *ibid*, v:129-130, *ḥadīth* no. 21226.

[18] *ibid*, v:130, *ḥadīth* no. 21227.

that the whole episode is spurious, and indeed early scholars such as an-Nawawī and Ibn Ḥazm denounced these reports as lies fathered upon Ibn Masʿūd.[19]

Ibn Ḥajar, among the *muḥaddithīn's* leading scholars, objects to this conclusion. Since Ibn Ḥanbal, Bazzār, aṭ-Ṭabarānī and others quoted this incident with authentic transmission chains, he reasons that the allegations cannot be discarded. To do otherwise is to negate a genuine *ḥadīth* without any relevant support. Attempting to harmonize between the disparate reports, Ibn Ḥajar resorts to Ibn aṣ-Ṣabbāgh's interpretation: at the time of his first remarks Ibn Masʿūd was hesitant about their status, but as they were unquestionably part of the Qur'ān in the *umma's* belief, his doubts dissipated and he came to believe likewise.[20]

This is the staunchest argument I have come across in support of these accusations. To dissect this further I will rely on the *muḥaddithīn's* methodology to show the error of Ibn Ḥajar's stance.

ii. Ibn Masʿūd's Beliefs

Earlier I stressed that *al-Fātiḥa*, the seven most oft-repeated verses in mosques and houses since the Prophet's time, could not by any stretch of logic have been denied by Ibn Masʿūd. That leaves us with sūras 113 and 114. In the third account we find that Ubayy, on hearing that he had omitted the concluding sūras, made no attempt to rebuff him. What does this imply? Either that he agreed with him, or disagreed but held back due to indifference. Given that Ubayy's Muṣḥaf included both sūras we cannot affirm the former; similarly we must reject the latter because apathy is tantamount to saying that people are free to choose whichever morsels of the Qur'ān they find appealing. No one can champion this attitude and still remain Muslim. Therefore the report of Ubayy's silence is plainly false.[21]

Next we turn to Ibn aṣ-Ṣabbāgh's harmonization. Many Companions such as Fāṭima, ʿĀ'isha, Abū Huraira, Ibn ʿAbbās and Ibn Masʿūd, report that the Prophet used to recite the Qur'ān with Archangel Jibrīl annually during Ramaḍān, doing so twice in the year of his death. In that final year Ibn Masʿūd was a participant. He also twice recited the Book to the Prophet, who extolled him with the words *laqad aḥsanta* (لقد أحسنت: 'You have done well'). Based on this incident Ibn ʿAbbās considers Ibn Masʿūd's readings to be definitive.[22] Such accolades demonstrate that the Qur'ān was etched in his memory with full certainty. His pupils, distinguished names such as ʿAlqama, al-Aswad, Masrūq, as-Sulamī, Abū Wā'il, ash-Shaibānī, al-Hamadānī and Zirr, transmitted the Qur'ān from him in its 114 sūra entirety. One of Zirr's students, ʿĀṣim, is alone in reporting this abnormal account even though he himself taught all 114 sūras on Ibn Masʿūd's authority.[23]

---

[19] As-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān*, i:221.

[20] See as-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān*, i:221-22. In translating this Burton was dishonest. Compare the original text with the latter's rendering in *The Collection of the Qur'ān*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1977, pp. 223-24.

[21] See the paragraph about al-Bāqillānī, pp. 234 - 35.

One of Ibn Ḥajar's works, a small treatise on *ḥadīth* named *Nuzhat al-Naẓar,* tells us that if a trustworthy narrator (say a grade B scholar) goes against another narrator of higher standing (a grade A scholar), or that if we have more scholars (all of the same grade) supporting one version of the story over the other, then the lower narration is branded as *shādh* (شاذ: aberrant). In the above report what we have is a lone statement swimming against a tidal wave of thousands, so this must be treated as *bāṭil* (باطل: false).[24] This is based on the *muḥaddithīn's* own methodology, and though Ibn Ḥajar cites the rule in his book it seems that he had a mental lapse and forgot about it in this instance, as even the greatest minds are prone to do. One may argue that building a case against a *shādh* or *bāṭil* report requires the presence of two conflicting statements, while what we have here is a single account regarding the erasure of sūras 113 and 114, with nothing to the contrary. The reason is simple: in a normal situation only abnormality gets reported. For example, no one publicizes that the blood gushing in our veins is red, as this is something we take for granted, but to have blue blood (the horseshoe crab) is out of the ordinary and so gains a measure of publicity. By the same token, we cannot reproach Ibn Masʿūd's students for failing to tell us whether their teacher believed in 114 sūras, since that is the norm. Only those who believe in less, or more, become news.

These comments about Ibn Masʿūd's Muṣḥaf can be similarly employed for Ubayy bin Kaʿb, or anyone else for that matter.

4. When Can Any Writing be Accepted as Part of the Qur'ān?

Ḥammād b. Salama reported that Ubayy's Muṣḥaf contained two extra sūras, called *al-Hafad* and *al-Khalaʿ*.[25] This narrative is completely spurious because of a major chain defect, an unaccounted-for gap of at least two to

---

[22] For details see Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad, ḥadīth* nos. 2494, 3001, 3012, 3422, 3425, 3469, 3539 and 3845. Of particular note are pp. 3001 and 3422.

[23] As-Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān,* i:221.

[24] Ibn Ḥajar, *Nuzhat al-Naẓar,* pp. 36-37.

[25] Ibn Ḍurais, *Faḍā'il al-Qur'ān,* p. 157.

three generations between Ubayy's death (*c.* 30 A.H.) and Ḥammād's (*d.* 167 A.H.) scholarly activity. Besides this, we must remember that a note written in a book does not make it part of the book. But let us accept that a few extra lines were scribbled inside Ubayy's Muṣḥaf for argument's sake. Would these lines ascend to the position of Qur'ān? Certainly not. The completed ʿUthmāni Muṣḥaf, disseminated with instructors who taught after the manner of relevant authorities, forms the basis for establishing whether any given text is Qur'ān—not the unsubstantiated squiggles of a manuscript for which we have no pedigree.

i. Principles for Determining Whether a Verse Belongs to the Qur'ān

The following three principles must be fulfilled before the manner of recitation for any verse can be accepted as Qur'ān:

- The *qirā'at* must be narrated not from a single authority but through a multitude, enough in fact to extinguish the risk of mistakes seeping through, going back to the Prophet and thereby advocating recitational authenticity and certainty. This is the concept of tawātur discussed earlier.[26]
- The text of the recitation must conform to the ʿUthmāni Muṣḥaf.
- The pronunciation must agree with proper Arabic grammar.

All authoritative works on *qirā'āt* (قراءات), such as Ibn Mujāhid's *Kitāb as-Sabʿa fī al-Qirā'āt,* generally name a lone reciter from every center of Islamic activity followed by two or three of his students. Such sparse listings appear to contradict the very first principle: how can citing one reciter and two pupils from Baṣra, for example, prove that this *qirā'at* was transmitted through a multitude? In clarifying this issue the reader is asked to review "Certificates of Reading" from the previous chapter.[27] Prof. Robson and Isḥāq Khān, supplying the transmission lineage for *Sunan Ibn Mājah* through Ibn Qudāma, arrive at a mere handful of names, whereas by tracing the reading certificates we find over four hundred and fifty pupils. And that is only in one manuscript; additional copies from the same chain might yield a far greater tally. Similarly the citing of two or three students is purely representative and is meant to conserve the author's time and parchment, leaving it up to the interested scholar to scour the reading notes for full details.

A fundamental difference separates the Qur'ān from the Prophet's *sunna* in the case of transmission through a single authority. A lone scholar memorizing a *ḥadīth* may, when teaching from memory, find it necessary to substitute a synonym if the exact word escapes his mind. With no one else transmitting this *ḥadīth*, his inaccuracy may pass undetected. Contrast this with the Qur᾿ān. During the three audible daily prayers, Friday prayers, *tarāwīḥ* and *ʿīd* prayers, the imām recites loudly with the backing of his entire congregation. If no one in the congregation objects then his recitation has everyone's consent—hundreds, thousands, or perhaps even hundreds of thousands of worshipers. But if objections are voiced in the course of prayer and the imām insists on a reading contrary to ʿUthmān's Muṣḥaf, he will be removed instantly from his post. No inaccuracies in *qirā᾿at* can pass undetected, and whatever crosses the boundaries of the acceptable is rooted out. This well-defined boundary is one of the great safeguards of the Qur᾿ān.[28]

---

[26] See pp. 90 - 91.

[27] See pp. 222 - 27.

When the time came for ʿUthmān to compile the Qur᾿ān (and the same is true of Abū Bakr), Companions were requested to bring forth only those parchments which they had copied *in the Prophet's presence*, along with personal testimony.[29] These documents were thus first-hand accounts consisting of both oral and written source in tandem. No parchment could compete in value (*i.e.* share 'equal status') unless it too enjoyed similar credentials.[30] Though Caliph ʿUthmān's name has become associated with the Muṣḥaf, the compilation was in every respect a community effort, built of the concordant multiple (تواتر: *tawātur*) accounts of first-hand evidence and the innate certainty therein. The nature of this group effort precluded that the Companions as a whole should agree on something false. Any solitary parchments whose consonantal text differed recurrently from what the Companions were proffering through *tawātur* channels therefore became an isolated report (آحاد: *āḥād*).[31] Such variants, though they may at a later

---

[28] Once again I refer to al-Masjid al-Ḥarām in Makkah where, on Friday the 16th and again on Friday the 23rd of Ramaḍān (1420 A.H.), an estimated 1.6 million worshipers congregated for Friday prayers. I personally attended the former, and watched the latter on television. Among such a massive congregation are countless thousands of *ḥuffāẓ* from every imaginable corner of the globe, along with several other thousands who follow the imām by looking into a Muṣḥaf during the *tarāwīḥ* prayers. Any error or lapse of memory, and the imām is promptly and audibly corrected by the numerous hundreds in his vicinity. Conversely, by remaining silent the entire congregation affirms its acceptance of the imām's *qirā᾿at*, so that his recitation is symbolically backed by the strength of one million worshipers. One can only imagine how emphatic the response will be if an imām insists on a *qirā᾿at* that is unacceptable to the masses.

[29] See sections 6.1.iii and 7.3.ii.

[30] Refer back to section 6.1.iv.

[31] Ṣābūnī al-Bāqillanī, *Nukat al-Intiṣar Linaql al-Qur᾿ān*, pp. 100-102; al-Jazarī, *Munjid al-Muqri᾿īn*, p. 17.

date be attributed to a Companion, could not attain the level of certainty inherent in the concordant testimonies.[32] By preparing multiple master copies of the Muṣḥaf, Zaid bin Thābit was able to accommodate authentic recitations agreed upon through *tawātur* as their consonantal texts differed from each other in only a handful of letters here and there. These were the multiple readings for certain words, originating back to the Prophet, which we have earlier discussed.[33] Conversely, isolated reports were by definition incompatible with the *tawātur* recitations and so were no longer supported by the Muṣḥaf's orthography.[34]

ʿUthmān's Muṣḥaf, disseminated to all sites of ongoing textual disputes, was pivotal in quelling dissension between Arabs and in streamlining the text for non-Arabs, just as certain dialectic and *aḥruf* concessions had, in an earlier time, been vital in teaching the first generation of illiterate Muslims who were unaccustomed to literary dialects. If any researcher now brings forth a parchment with wording that is significantly different from ʿUthmān's Muṣḥaf, one whose consonantal backbone does not settle into the Muṣḥaf's text, it cannot be accepted as Qur᾿ān. This is because it cannot share 'equal status' with the Muṣḥaf, which was compiled from first-hand documents backed by personal testimony. One is of known pedigree and the other is a complete unknown. As the Companions have all passed away, no parchment can ever share equal value with the Muṣḥaf as we have no way of assessing if the differences are due to a careless scribe, faulty transmission chains that do not reach back to the Prophet, outdated text that does not reflect the final sequence of revealed or abrogated verses, dialectic or *aḥruf* concessions that have long since been revoked, or a combination of the above. We do not know if the scribe ever saw the Prophet, let alone wrote it in his presence. It may be pre-ʿUthmānic or post-ʿUthmānic or a curio or a fake, but it embodies none of the certainties of the ʿUthmānic text and therefore cannot be regarded as Qur᾿ān. Similarly if any manuscript comes to light listing variants that are contrary to the ʿUthmānic orthography, this cannot be counted as Qur᾿ān because such a narrative, by opposing the

---

[32] Such variant accounts not only fail the test of certainty, they even contradict each other as we have seen regarding Ibn Masʿūd's Muṣḥaf in this chapter. Refer also to A. Al-Imam, *Variant Readings of the Qur'an: A Critical Study of their Historical and Linguistic Origins*, IIIT, London & Washington, 2006, pp. 50-57.

[33] Refer back to Chapters 11 and 12.

[34] If they did exist early on, such reports may have stemmed from dialectic concessions or usage of some of the seven *aḥruf*, and it is very likely that these had already been rescinded during the Prophet's final recitations with Jibrīl, which constituted the final revealed version of the Qur᾿ānic text [Al-Imam, op. cit., pp. 42-43.] In this case fragments still containing evidence of these concessions were outdated and no longer sound.

Companions' *tawātur* consensus, by definition becomes an isolated account regardless of the *isnād's* quality. The limit of what is allowable within the Qur'ānic text is dependent entirely on concordant multitudinous testimony and this can never be superseded by an aberrant or isolated report.

Here it is worth recalling that vowels (and especially *alif* in the middle of a word) frequently display orthographic abnormalities depending on the scribe's discretion—see pp. 144 - 50 and also the recently published facsimile of Qur'ānic fragments in France.[35] In the latter we find قالوا written as قلوا. Conceivably the same may be true of the Yemeni fragments. Differences on this level pose no confusion; we must treat the issue exactly the same as color *vs.* colour, and center *vs.* centre, since orthographic divergence is an integral thread of every language.[36] If, similarly, there is a consonantal character missing due to scribal error then it will be accepted as a piece of the Qur'ān with such. The published French facsimile provides at least one good example, where the scribe inadvertently dropped the letter ف and penned الفوحش as الوحش.[37] But if the scrap of parchment, despite our best allowance for orthographic differences or chance errors, fails to slip comfortably into the 'Uthmāni skeleton, then we must cast it away as distorted and void.

ii. Examples of Scholars Punished for Violating these Principles

- Ibn Shanbūdh (*d.* 328 A.H./939 C.E.), one of the greatest scholars of his day in the field of *qirā'āt*, resolved to ignore the 'Uthmāni text in reciting the Qur'ān. Because the reading was proven correct through different transmission channels and conformed with the rules of Arabic grammar, he claimed that it retained validity even if it differed from 'Uthmān's Muṣḥaf. Put to trial, he was asked to repent and finally received ten lashes as punishment.[38]

  An-Nadīm quotes Ibn Shanbūdh's letter of confession:[39]

  فكتب: يقول محمد بن أحمد بن أيوب «قد كنت أقرأ حروفاً تخالف مصحف عثمان (بن عفان) المجمع عليه، والذي اتفق أصحاب رسول الله ﷺ على قراءته، ثم بان لي أن ذلك خطأ وأنا منه تائب، وعنه مقلع، وإلى الله جلّ اسمه منه بريء، إذ كان مصحف عثمان هو الحق الذي لا يجوز خلافه، ولا يقرأ غيره»

  "I used to read letters that were contrary to the Muṣḥaf of 'Uthmān, that which is collectively adhered to and upon whose recitation the Companions of the Prophet formed their consensus. I then realized the error of my ways and now seek Allāh's pardon. I am quitting my misdeed and am innocent of it before Allāh, since 'Uthmān's Muṣḥaf is the truth which cannot be contradicted and the standard which must never be violated."

- Another scholar, Ibn Miqsam (*d.* 354 A.H./965 C.E.), was asked to repent in the presence of *fuqahā'* (فقهاء: professors of Islamic law) and *qurrā'* for his theory on recitation. His view held that any reading, if in line with the Muṣḥaf of 'Uthmān and the rules of language, was valid, obviating the need to search the proper channels of *qirā'āt* and verify the correct diacritical marks associated with every verse.[40]

One scholar sought to ignore the second principle, and the other the first. Rev. Mingana felt sorry for these two men.[41] At least we can take comfort in knowing that they were shown greater mercy than William Tyndale (*c.* 1494-1536) who, for daring to translate the Bible into English (the basis of the King James Version), was sentenced to death, betrayed, strangled until dead, then tied up and burned at the stake.[42]

5. Conclusion

Judeo-Christian scholars have long cast their eyes towards the Qur'ān in search of variances, but so securely has Allāh preserved His Book that their vast efforts and resources have yielded them little more than fatigue. In the 20th century the University of Munich set up an Institute of Qur'ānic Research. Its halls lay host to over forty thousand copies of the Qur'ān, spanning different centuries and countries, mostly as photos of originals, while its staff busied themselves with the collation of every word from every copy in a relentless excavation for variants.

> Shortly before the Second World War, a preliminary and tentative report was published that there are of course copying mistakes in the manuscripts of the Qur'ān, but no variants. During the war,

---

[35] F. Déroche and S.N. Noseda, *Sources de la transmission manuscrite du texte Coranique, Les manuscrits de style ḥigāzī, Volume 1. Le manuscrit arabe 328(a) de la Bibliotheque nationale de France,* 1998.

[36] To this we can append certain differences in the pronunciation of the consonantal text. Just as 'bridge' is read 'brij', so in the Qur'ān we eye من بعد but read *mimba'd*, and this in no way constitutes a deviation from 'Uthmān's Muṣḥaf.

[37] Déroche and Noseda, op. cit., p. 126.

[38] Al-Jazarī, *Ṭabaqāt al-Qurrā'*, ii:53-55.

[39] An-Nadīm, *al-Fihrist*, p. 35.

[40] *ibid*, ii:124.

[41] Mingana, *Transmission*, pp. 231-2.

[42] "William Tyndale", *Encyclopedia Britannica (Micropaedia)*, 15th edition, 1974, x:218.

connected with the Hebrew OT. Stripping away all Qur'ānic terminology, Wansbrough speaks instead of *Haggadic exegesis, Halakhic exegesis,* and *Deutungsbedürftigkeit.*[52] Everyone also refers to the *canonization* of the Qur'ān, and the codices of Ibn Masʿūd. The vast majority of Muslims live in total ignorance of this jargon. While the hypotheses of Jeffery, Goldziher and others have been dealt with and dismissed, we have yet to fully gauge the motives behind such efforts. A sketch of early Judeo-Christian history, coupled with the histories of the Old and New Testaments, will facilitate a more thorough awareness of these scholars' mindset and lead to a detailed consideration of Western objectives regarding the Qur'ān.

---

[52] J. Wansbrough, *Quranic Studies: Sources and methods of scriptural interpretation*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1977, Table of Contents.

II

THE HISTORY OF THE BIBLICAL SCRIPTURES

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

EARLY HISTORY OF JUDAISM: A BRIEF LOOK

> Israel was in the thought of God before the creation of the Universe (Gen. R. 1.4) that heaven and earth were only created through the merit of Israel. As the world could not exist without the winds, so is it impossible for the world to exist without Israel.[1]

In examining the Scriptures it is best to proceed chronologically, beginning with the religious and political history of Judaism. The traditional Jewish accounts may well shock some, for this is a history peppered with idolatry and pagan ritual despite the best intervention of the Israelite prophets, like a story of moths drawn incessantly to a flame no matter how many times they are swatted away. By recounting the following episodes from the Old Testament (OT), my objective is to show that neither the prophets nor their advocacy of the Oneness of God were favorably regarded by the earliest Jews. This will segue into a brief history of the kings of Israel and Judah and their idolatrous lives. From this chapter the reader will leave with a taste of the circumstances under which the OT, laboring for many centuries, emerged bruised and battered and with no hope of being faithfully preserved.[2]

1. Jewish History Prior to Establishing the Kingdom

Birth of Ishmael and Isaac, sons of Abraham

1 Now Sarai Abram's[3] wife bore him no children: and she had an handmaid, an Egyptian, whose name was Hagar.

2. And Sarai said unto Abram, Behold now, the Lord hath restrained me from bearing: I pray thee, go in unto my maid; it may be that I may obtain children by her. And Abram hearkened to the voice of Sarai.

---

[1] Rev. Dr. A. Cohen, *Everyman's Talmud (London)*, p. 61, quoted by S.A. Zia, *A History of Jewish Crimes*, Union Book Stall, Karachi, 1969, p. 53.

[2] The reader must take into account that the majority of historical incidents mentioned in this chapter have either a direct bearing on the OT, or show how unfavorable the prevalent religious and moral practices were to the OT's intact survival. My purpose is not to provide a comprehensive history of the Israelites, for the interested reader can easily find references that detail their military excursions, political allegiances *etc.*

[3] This is how the name appears in Genesis, with 'Abram' changing to 'Abraham' upon his conversation with God.

3 And Sarai Abram's wife took Hagar her maid the Egyptian, after Abram had dwelt ten years in the land of Canaan, and gave her to her husband Abram to be his wife.
15 And Hagar bore Abram a son: and Abram called his son's name, which Hagar bore, Ishmael.[4]
15 And God said unto Abraham, As for Sarai thy wife, thou shalt not call her name Sarai, but Sarah shall her name be.
16 And I will bless her, and give thee a son also of her: yea, I will bless her, and she shall be a mother of nations; kings of people shall be of her.
17 Then Abraham fell upon his face, and laughed, and said in his heart, Shall a child be born unto him that is an hundred years old? and shall Sarah, that is ninety years old, bear?
18 And Abraham said unto God, O that Ishmael might live before thee!
19 And God said, Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son indeed; and thou shalt call his name Issac: and I will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant, and with his seed after him.[5]

Issac suddenly becomes the legitimate (and only begotten) son of Abraham

Josephus, a Jewish historian from the first century C.E., writes of "Isaac, the legitimate son of Abraham", and shortly afterwards declares, "Now Abraham greatly loved Isaac, as being his only begotten, and given to him at the border of old age, by the favor of God".[6] Is Josephus demoting Ishmael to the status of an illegitimate child, even though Genesis 16:3 proclaims that Sarah gave Hagar to her husband "to be his wife"? He declares Isaac as the only begotten despite having just discussed Ishmael at length, for the previous three pages.

From the time of Isaac's children onwards, the OT is replete with tales of knotted betrayals and sordid deeds which only undermine the reader's confidence in these key figures, and in how sincerely they embraced God's everlasting covenant.

Jacob deceives his father

After years of childlessness Isaac's wife, Rebekah, bore twin sons. Esau was born first from the womb and was cherished by his father, while she remained partial to Jacob. One day Esau returned from a hunting trip faint from hunger and begged Jacob for some red lentil soup, which he refused to offer him until he had relinquished his rights as the firstborn.[7] On a future occasion Rebekah and Jacob conspired together to trick Isaac through an elaborate ruse involving fake hair: mistaking Jacob's hand for Esau's, Isaac blessed him instead of his elder brother by saying, "Let peoples serve you, and nations bow down to thee: be lord over thy brethren".[8]

Father-in-law cheats son-in-law

When Esau threatened revenge because of the stolen blessing, Rebekah sent Jacob away to her brother Laban in Haran that he might marry his cousin, the beautiful Rachel. On arriving Jacob became enraptured with her and eagerly sought her hand,[9] but was first asked to work seven years for her father before his matrimonial dreams could be realized. Seven years later he did marry, but after spending the wedding night with his bride, enveloped in darkness, he was horrified to discover the next morning that his father-in-law had substituted for Rachel her plainer sister Leah.

A week later he was properly married to Rachel, but only after undertaking to work for his uncle another seven years. When Jacob finally left, his entourage included two wives, two concubines, eleven sons and one daughter.[10] In leaving Laban's house Rachel had stolen her father's household gods and Laban, pursuing and catching up with them, furiously searched the tents; but Rachel had quickly concealed the gods in a saddlebag upon which she sat and he returned empty-handed.[11] So this distinguished lineage, though already in custody of God's Covenant, prized their household gods most particularly.

Jacob wrestles with God

24 Afterwards, Jacob went back and spent the rest of the night alone. A man came and fought with Jacob until just before daybreak.
25 When the man saw that he could not win, he struck Jacob on the hip and threw it out of joint.
26 They kept on wrestling until the man said, "Let go of me! It's almost daylight." "You can't go until you bless me," Jacob replied.
27 Then the man asked, "What is your name?" "Jacob," he answered.
28 The man said, "Your name will no longer be Jacob. You have wrestled with God and with men, and you have won. That's why your name will be Israel."[12]

---

[4] Genesis Ch. 16. *King James Version (KJV).*

[5] *KJV,* Genesis Ch. 17. For a discussion on the corruption and interpolation in Gen. Ch.17, refer to pp. 292 - 97.

[6] *Josephus,* pp. 42-43.

[7] Genesis 25:29-34.

[8] Genesis 27:1-29.

[9] Genesis 29:1-7.

[10] Genesis Ch. 31.

[11] Genesis 31:19-35.

[12] *Contemporary English Version (CEV),* Genesis 32:24-28. In Hebrew one meaning of 'Israel' is "a man who wrestles with God" (see the footnote for Genesis 32:28).

To someone from outside the Judeo-Christian tradition the concept of a human, of mortal flesh and blood, physically tackling God into the daylight hours (and winning) is inconceivable, if not profane.

Jacob's family

Jacob had two wives (a) Leah, who gave birth to: Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Issachar and Zebulun; and (b) Rachel, who gave birth to: Joseph and Benjamin. He also had two concubines (a) Bilhah, Rachel's handmaid, who bore him: Dan and Naphtali; and (b) Zilpah, Leah's handmaid, who bore him: Gad and Asher. Thus "Jacob had twelve sons".[13]

The terrible famine which struck during Jacob's twilight years was the impetus for his migration to Egypt.[14] His son Joseph had ascended to the post of Egypt's governor by then, and invited his parents and brothers to join him as the land still held grain.[15] "Sixty-six members of Jacob's family went to Egypt with him, not counting his daughters-in-law. Jacob's two grandsons who were born there made it a total of seventy members of Jacob's family in Egypt."[16] This includes all his children and grandchildren from both wives and both concubines.

Moses

Moses' grandfather Kohath had arrived in Egypt from Canaan with *his* grandfather Jacob,[17] such that the only person in the lineage to be Egyptian-born was Moses' father, Amram.[18] Though born there Moses left more than forty years before his death, so that Jacob's descendants resided in Egypt for only 215 years.[19] Living there as freemen, Jacob's family enjoyed immense prosperity and their numbers surged rapidly, but this stirred great jealousy within the Egyptian populace and ultimately goaded them into enslaving the Israelites; in the eighty years preceding the Exodus, all their male newborns were put to death by order of the pharaoh.[20]

Saved by God's mercy as an infant, Moses was forced to flee in adulthood for killing an Egyptian, and because the king and the military grew envious of his success in the Ethiopian campaign. Escaping to Midian, he married and settled there till he was commissioned by God

---

[13] Genesis 35:23-26.

[14] Genesis 41:53-57.

[15] Genesis Ch. 45.

[16] *CEV*, Genesis 46:26-27.

[17] Genesis 46:8-15.

[18] Refer to Exodus 6:16-20.

[19] For details see Kairanawi (al-Hindī), *Iẓhārul Ḥaq*, vol. 1, pp. 266-68, in which the author quotes several Jewish sources.

[20] *ibid*, vol. 1, p. 64.

to be His apostle, to return to his birthplace and deliver the Israelites from bondage.[21]

The Lord 'advises' Israelites to steal their neighbor's jewels

Having entreated Pharaoh to release the Israelites with no ostensible success, Moses and Aaron then stood witness to a kaleidoscope of plagues which ravaged Egypt. "And the Lord said unto Moses, yet will I bring one plague more upon Pharaoh, and upon Egypt. Afterwards he will let you go hence.... Speak now in the ears of the people, and let every man borrow of his neighbor, and every woman of her neighbor, jewels of silver, and jewels of gold."[22]

The Israelites obeyed Moses and sought from their Egyptian neighbors trinkets of gold, silver and other valuables, and God softened their neighbors' hearts such that they gave them whatever the Israelites desired. "In this way they carried away the wealth of the Egyptians when they left Egypt."[23] This passage, which legitimizes the taking of other's wares, implies that all such valuables are the rightful property of God's chosen people alone. In fact Deuteronomy 33:2,

> indicates that the Almighty offered the Torah to the Gentile nations also, but since they refused to accept it, He withdrew His 'shining' legal protection from them, and transferred their property rights to Israel, who observed His Law. A passage of Habakkuk is quoted as confirming this claim.[24]

Number of Israelites at the Exodus estimated at 2,000,000

Moses and Aaron, one year after the Exodus, counted the total number of men who were at least twenty years old and of fighting strength. Their tally yielded 603,550 Israelites.[25] The Levi tribe was not included in this figure, and neither were females of all ages, old men, and any young men under twenty. Allowing for these groups as well we can infer that – according to the OT – the total number taking part in the Exodus probably exceeded two million Jews. I will leave it to the imaginative reader to surmise how a tribe of seventy people, freshly arriving in Egypt, were able to multiply in excess of two million within a mere 215 years, especially when their male newborns were being systematically killed for the previous eight decades. Such is the OT as it rests in our hands today.

---

[21] Exodus Ch.1-4.

[22] Exodus 11:1-2.

[23] *CEV*, Exodus 12:36.

[24] *The Jewish Encyclopaedia*, Article 'Gentile', vol. 5, p. 620. Contrast this with Prophet Muḥammad's conduct towards the very members of Quraish who plotted his assassination, and his request to 'Alī to stay behind and return all the valuables they had entrusted him with. See p. 30.

[25] Numbers 1:20-46.

The stone tablets and the golden calf

Moses ascended the mount and supplicated there for forty days. "At the end of that time God gave him 'two tablets of the testimony, tablets of stone, written with the finger of God'."[26]

> 1 And when the people saw that Moses delayed to come down out of the mount, the people gathered themselves together unto Aaron, and said unto him, Up, make us gods, which shall go before us; for as for this Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we know not what is become of him.
>
> 2 And Aaron said unto them, Break off the golden earrings, which *are* in the ears of your wives, of your sons, and of your daughters, and bring *them* unto me.
>
> 4 And he received them at their hand, and fashioned it with a graving tool, after he had made it a molten calf: and they said, These *be thy* gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt.
>
> 6 And they rose up early on the morrow, and offered burnt offerings, and brought peace offerings; and the people sat down to eat and to drink, and rose up to play.[27]

This is the classic tale of ingratitude in the OT, the tale of the Israelite's disloyalty towards the One Who had only recently put an end to their shackles and parted the sea for their escape. On the verge of punishing them for their intransigence, the Almighty at the last moment "repented of the evil which He thought to do unto his people".[28] This notion too, of God *repenting* like some common sinner, is yet another of the OT's unfathomable images.

Wandering in the wilderness

In the wilderness the Jews frequently tried to stone Moses. At the same time Aaron and Miriam spoke out against their brother, their jealously of him reaching its pinnacle.

> The Lord was angry at this attack, and Miriam was stricken with leprosy. Moses prayed that she be forgiven, and she recovered after seven days of isolation in the desert outside the camp. Oddly enough Aaron was not punished – perhaps because of his priestly role.[29]

---

[26] Joan Comay and Ronald Brownrigg, *Who's Who in the Bible: The Old Testament and the Apocrypha and the New Testament, Two Volumes in One.* Bonanza Books, New York, 1980, p. 283, quoting Exodus 31:18. This book will subsequently be referred to as *Who's Who.*

[27] Exodus 32:1-6.

[28] Exodus 32:14.

[29] *Who's Who*, p. 285.

Levite Korah also instigated a revolt and spoke out "against Moses and Aaron, together with Dathan and Abiram and two hundred and fifty leaders".[30]

Towards the close of these wanderings Moses assembled the congregation near the Jordanian boundary and delivered a detailed proclamation, giving them the Laws and the constitution of the government.[31]

> Moses told these priests and leaders: Each year the Israelites must come together to celebrate the Festival of Shelters at the place where the Lord chooses to be worshiped. You must read these laws and teachings to the people at the festival every seventh year, the year when loans do not need to be repaid. Everyone must come – men, women, children, and even the foreigners who live in your towns. And each new generation will listen and learn to worship the Lord their God with fear and trembling and to do exactly what is said in God's Law.[32]

There is no evidence that this practice of reciting the laws every seventh year took place, partly due to the turbulent political circumstances which soon engulfed the Israelites.[33] Also, as we shall see in the next chapter, all the books ascribed to Moses were in fact written several hundred years later.

Only a short while afterwards Moses passed away, as had most of the generation that fled across the sea four decades earlier. With Joshua inheriting leadership, he resumed the march towards Canaan and led them across the Jordan River to victories over Jericho and other towns.[34]

The Time of the Judges – the Ark falls into enemy hands (*c.* 1200-1020 B.C.)

The elders of Israel decreed that the Ark[35] be removed from the temple of Shiloh, to lead the Israelite army in its assault on the Philistines. But the Ark fell into enemy hands and soon most of the Israelite cities, including the temple of Shiloh, were reduced to ruins.[36]

---

[30] Numbers 16:3.

[31] Josephus, *Antiq.*, Book 4, Ch.8, p. 114 to the end of the chapter. The speech concludes on p. 123.

[32] *CEV*, Deuteronomy 31:10-13, p. 237.

[33] See p. 266.

[34] James Hastings, D.D., *Dictionary of the Bible (Second Edition)*, T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1963, p. 433.

[35] According to Deuteronomy 10:1-5, the Ark contained the second pair of stone tablets on which God had again chiseled the Ten Commandments – "It has been suggested that the original Ark was a box containing sacred stones in which the Deity was conceived to dwell" [*Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 53].

[36] *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 434.

2. Jewish History After Establishing the Kingdom

Saul's reign (*c.* 1020-1000 B.C.)
Given that the Israelites' hierocratic government had proved ineffectual in resisting the Philistines, the prophet Samuel assisted in establishing a hereditary monarchy. Saul became its first beneficiary, ascending to the throne despite Samuel's possible misgivings.[37]

David's reign (*c.* 1000-962 B.C.)
Though expelled from Saul's court David had always demonstrated remarkable qualities of leadership and, when Saul fell at Gilboa, David declared himself king.[38]

Bathsheba's story is worth recounting: David once spied an exquisite woman bathing in the moonlight. After inquiry he learned her to be Bathsheba, wife of Uriah, a Hittite officer on active service at the front. David discreetly sent for her and made love to her, through which she became pregnant. To avoid an impending scandal he recalled her husband from the front at Bathsheba's request, that he might go to his wife. But as Uriah spent his leave with friends instead of going to her, David plotted to have him killed in the battlefield. This being done, he soon married her. The child she bore did not survive, but later she bore him a second son, Solomon, and was instrumental in appointing him king.[39]

Solomon's reign (*c.* 962-931 B.C.)
Solomon's lavish lifestyle was a drastic departure from his father's simple ways and, according to biblical legend, he was not content with marrying the daughters of his tributaries for he filled his harem with other women besides. The claim made in 1 Kings 11:3, that he possessed 700 wives and 300 concubines, is likely an exaggeration though.[40] He built the Temple in Jerusalem on a massive scale,[41] dedicating it to the singular worship of Yahweh.[42] Simultaneously though he erected pagan shrines for his numerous heathen wives; "he himself, moreover, is said to have been influenced by his wives to pay some tokens of respect to their gods, while he remained essentially a Yahwist".[43]

i. The Divided Kingdoms

Following his death, Solomon's realm was splintered into the twin states of Judah and Israel.

> When the kingdom was divided... [the] empire came to an end. The time of her political glory had been less than a century, and her empire disappeared, never to return. The nation, being divided and its parts often warring with one another, could not easily become again a power of importance.[44]

A. KINGS OF ISRAEL
Here I will briefly point out some of the kings of Israel, and offer the reader a taste of the political and religious anarchy which seized that country.

1. Jeroboam I, son of Solomon (931-910 B.C.)
   The first king of Israel after the splitting of the monarchy. As people were discontent with Solomon's taxation policies, he had started plotting against him through encouragement from the priest Ahijah. Caught and condemned to death by his own father, he fled to Egypt and there received political asylum. Solomon's other son, Rehoboam, ascended to the throne on his father's death, and at this point the northern tribes decided to secede and establish the separate kingdom of Israel, with Jeroboam happily abandoning his life in exile to become its first ruler.[45]

   Conscious of religion's central role in his nation, Jeroboam feared that his subjects might travel to the southern kingdom of Judah to offer sacrifices in Jerusalem, at Solomon's Temple. To curb this possibility he had to wean their sights away from the Temple, so he "revived the traditional sanctuaries at Bethel near his southern border and Dan in the extreme north, and set up golden calves in them, as Aaron had done in the desert".[46]

---

[37] *ibid*, p. 434.

[38] 2 Samuels 2:4.

[39] *Who's Who*, pp. 65-66, 93. Islam denounces this tale as a brazen lie. S.L. McKenzie, a professor of the Hebrew Bible at Rhodes College in Memphis, Tennessee, claims that David was a tyrannical Middle Eastern despot who ascended to the throne through a campaign of terror, violence and mass murder. He was never a shepherd, McKenzie continues, and almost certainly had no part to play in Goliath's death. [Jonathan Thompson, "Bible's King David exposed as despot who did not kill Goliath", *The Independent*, London, 19 Nov. 2000]. Again these allegations run counter to what Islam preaches.

[40] *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 435.

[41] 1 Kings, Chapters 5-8.

[42] The Hebrew term for God.

[43] *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 410. Islam rejects these allegations.

[44] *ibid*, p. 436.

[45] *Who's Who*, p. 205.

[46] *ibid*, p. 206.

2. Nadab to Jehoram (910-841 B.C.)
Jeroboam was followed by a succession of kings who, on occasion, enjoyed the throne but briefly before suffering the assassin's knife. The eight kings of this period walked in the ways of Jeroboam, allowing sinful conduct in religious matters and turning the people away from the notion of one true God.[47] Ahab (874-853 B.C.) went so far as to introduce the Phoenician god Baal as one of the gods of Israel, to appease his wife.[48] The last king of this period, Jehoram, was massacred along with his entire family and all the prophets of Baal, by his general Jehu.[49]

3. Jehu (841-814 B.C.)
Having led the revolt instigated by the prophet Elisha, Jehu announced that God had appointed him king of Israel to wipe out the sinful house of Ahab. He butchered all the family members of the three previous kings who had worshipped Baal, beheading Ahab's seventy sons and piling their heads in two heaps.[50] He then wrenched the country into religious reformation.[51]

4. Jehoahaz to Hoshea (814-724 B.C.)
Despite Jehu's reforms the country soon commenced an alarming military decline, the one note of triumph being Joash's victory over Amaziah, who was king of Judah at the time. Joash (798-783 B.C.) plundered gold and silver vessels from the Temple of Solomon, along with much of that country's royal treasury.[52] Otherwise the period was marked by a rapid series of assassinations and the submission of Israel to Assyrian power.[53] Hoshea (732-724 B.C.), the last king of Israel, made a rash attempt to throw off the Assyrian yoke; Shalmaneser, the new Assyrian ruler, reacted by invading what was left of Israel and capturing and imprisoning Hoshea. The capital Samaria surrendered in 721 B.C., and with the deportation of its inhabitants came the end of the northern kingdom of Israel.[54]

---

[47] *ibid*, pages 63, 107, 291 and 394. See also *Josephus*, p. 236.

[48] *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 16.

[49] *Who's Who*, p. 192.

[50] *ibid*, pp. 194-95.

[51] *ibid*, pp. 194-95.

[52] *Who's Who*, p. 215. He also visited the aged prophet Elisha after his victory, which makes one wonder whether Elisha condoned the stealing of gold and silver vessels from Solomon's Temple.

[53] *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 471; *Who's Who*, pages 260, 312 and 345.

[54] *Who's Who*, p. 159, quoting 2 Kgs 15:30.

B. KINGS OF JUDAH

Like Israel, this country too was gripped by anarchy and idolatry. Some of the details in this section will provide an important framework for the next chapter and its discussion of the OT's preservation.

1. Rehoboam, son of King Solomon, to Abijah (931-911 B.C.)
The first king of Judah and the successor to Solomon's throne, Rehoboam had eighteen wives, sixty concubines, twenty-eight sons and sixty daughters. Biblical scholars have painted the religions conditions of his time in dark colors,[55] and the OT states that the people,

> also built [themselves] high places and images, and groves, on every high hill,[56] and under every green tree. And there were also sodomites in the land, and they did according to all abominations of the nations which the Lord cast out before the children of Israel.[57]

His son Abijah, ruling three years only, followed in his ways.[58]

2. Asa to Jehoshaphat (911-848 B.C.)
Asa (911-870 B.C.) is praised in the Bible for his piety.

> He stamped out idolatrous practices and restored the Temple in Jerusalem as the center of worship. It was decreed that unbelievers would be put to death. Asa even stripped of her dignities his grandmother Maacah .... [who] had fashioned an obscene idol connected with the cult of the Phoenician fertility goddess Ashtoreth.[59]

He sent Temple treasure to Benhadad of Damascus, to persuade him to invade Israel and thus relieve the pressure on Judah.[60] His son Jehoshaphat (870-848 B.C.) continued Asa's reforms and destroyed many of the local hill-shrines.[61]

3. Jehoram to Ahaz (848-716 B.C.)
This period, covering the reign of eight kings, saw a return to idolatry and moral degeneracy. Jehoram (848-840 B.C.) constructed high

---

[55] *Who's Who*, pp. 322-23; *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 840.

[56] Groves were used as sites for pagan rituals of fornication, where mass orgies took place underneath trees planted specifically for that purpose. See Elizabeth Dilling, *The Plot Against Christianity*, p. 14.

[57] 1 Kings 14:23-4.

[58] *Who's Who*, p. 25; *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 4.

[59] *Who's Who*, p. 56.

[60] *Dictionary of the Bible*, pp. 59-60.

[61] *Who's Who*, p. 193.

places in the mountains of Judah and compelled the inhabitants of Jerusalem to commit fornication,[62] while his son Ahaziah introduced Baal as one of the gods of Judah.[63] Similarly, Amaziah (796-781 B.C.) set up the gods of Seir as his own gods, prostrating before them.[64] His successor Uzziah put much effort into developing the kingdom,[65] but with Ahaz (736-716 B.C.) Judah declined rapidly. Ahaz "indulged in pagan cults and revived the primitive custom of child sacrifices",[66] going so far as to sacrifice his own son as a means of invoking Yahweh's favor.[67] Eventually, as a token of his submission to Assyrian rule, he was compelled to replace the worship of Yahweh in Solomon's Temple with that of Assyrian deities.[68]

4. Hezekiah (716-687 B.C.)
   Succeeding his father Ahaz at the age of 25, he proved himself to be one of Judah's most prominent rulers and carried out the following reforms:
   - He destroyed the brazen serpent that Moses had made, which had been an object of worship in the Temple.[69]
   - He cleansed the country sanctuaries from idolatry and cut down the groves used for pagan rituals of promiscuity.[70]

5. Manasseh to Amon (687-640 B.C.)
   Manasseh (687-642 B.C.) reacted against his father's reforms by reinstating the altars which Hezekiah had abolished, establishing new altars for Baal and worshipping the host of heavens and serving them. His son Amon continued these practices.[71]

6. Josiah (640-609 B.C.): the Torah miraculously rediscovered
   Succeeded his father at the age of eight. In his eighteenth year as king the high priest Hilkia showed Shapham, the royal scribe, a 'Book of the Law' which he had unearthed in the Temple during its renovation. It was read to Josiah and he became greatly agitated

---

[62] *KJV*, 2 Ch 21:11 (see also 21:13). In the *CEV* however the reference to fornication is omitted. See pp. 328 - 30.
[63] *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 17.
[64] 2 Chronicles 25:14.
[65] *Who's Who*, pp. 377-78; *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 1021.
[66] *Who's Who*, p. 44.
[67] *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 16.
[68] *ibid*, p. 16.
[69] 2 Kg 18:4.
[70] *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 382; *Who's Who*, p. 152; 2 Kings 23:14.
[71] *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 616; *Who's Who*, p. 50.

at how the religious practices of his time had gone astray.[72] Calling a public assembly in the Temple, he ordered that the entire Book be read to all those present before setting out on a program of sweeping reforms.

> The Temple was purged of all heathen altars and cult objects, particularly those belonging to the Assyrian worship of the sun, the moon and the stars.... The practice of child sacrifice ... was stopped 'that no one might burn his son or his daughter as an offering to Molech.' [2 kg 23:10] The idolatrous priests were killed, the pagan house of male prostitutes was pulled down, and the local shrines outside Jerusalem were destroyed and defiled by burning human bones on them.[73]

7. Jehoahaz to Mattaniah (609-587 B.C.)
   During this turbulent period Judah faced mounting pressure, first from the Egyptians and then the Babylonians. The latter were led by King Nebuchadnezzar, who took Judah's royal household captive to Babylon and left none behind but the poorest of the land.[74] Mattaniah (598-587 B.C.), the last ruler of Judah, was himself appointed by Nebuchadnezzar as a puppet king; after nine years of subservience he unwisely revolted through Egyptian encouragement, precipitating a Babylonian attack.[75]

ii. The Destruction of the First Temple (586 B.C.) and the Babylonian Exile (586-538 B.C.)

The people of Judah were in no position to resist the Babylonian assault. Pressing their siege of Jerusalem until the city surrendered in August 586 B.C., the invading army tore down the city walls and destroyed the Temple.

> Perhaps fifty thousand Judaeans, including women and children, had been transported to Babylonia in two deportations of Nebuchadnezzar. These, with the exception of a few political leaders, were settled in colonies, in which they were permitted to have houses of their own, to visit one another freely, and to engage in business [Jer 29:5ff].[76]

---

[72] *Who's Who*, p. 243.
[73] *ibid*, p. 243.
[74] *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 242; *Who's Who*, pp. 188-190. See also 2 Kings 24:14.
[75] *Who's Who*, p. 388; *Dictionary of the Bible*, pp. 1054-55.
[76] *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 440. See also J. Neusner, *The Way of Torah*, p. xiii.

iii. The Restoration of Jerusalem and the Founding of the Second Temple (515 B.C.)

A generation after the Exile, Babylon fell under Persian control. Jews were permitted to return to their homeland and a small number accepted the offer, establishing the Second Temple in Jerusalem by 515 B.C.[77] It was during these Second Temple times that the prophet Ezra first began his ceremonial reading of the Torah publicly (*c.* 449 B.C.). More of a religious than a political figure, he became the founder of legal Judaism and remained highly influential in Jewish thought throughout the ensuing centuries.[78]

iv. The Hellenistic Rule (333-168 B.C.), the Maccabaean Revolt (168-135 B.C.) and the Destruction of the Second Temple (70 C.E.)

With Alexander the Great's successful conquest of Palestine in 331 B.C., the Jews soon assimilated into Hellenistic culture.

> One curious aspect of this era of Hellenistic assimilation appears in the fact that one high priest, Onias III., deposed by the Seleucid authorities, went to Egypt and established at Leontopolis in the name of Heliopolis a dissident temple to Yahweh, which existed there for a hundred years.[79]

Antiochus IV, King of Syria, was particularly zealous in imposing Greek fashions and Greek religion on this conquered realm. Becoming suspicious of Jewish loyalty he commanded, in 168 B.C., that altars to Zeus be erected throughout the land, and especially within the Temple at Jerusalem. Although fear of the Syrian army secured widespread obedience to this decree, Judas Maccabee, a warrior, revolted and was able to defeat Antiochus' generals in several successive battles, raging from 165-160 B.C. He cleansed the Temple from Syrian influences and established a dynasty which survived until 63 B.C., though he himself was killed in 160 B.C.[80] The Maccabaean dynasty ended with the Roman conquest of Jerusalem, and just over one century later, in 70 C.E., Roman troops destroyed the Second Temple. "The second destruction proved final."[81]

---

[77] J. Neusner, *The Way of Torah*, pp. xiii, xxi.

[78] *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 441. See also Nehemiah Ch.8.

[79] *ibid*, p. 442.

[80] *ibid*, pp. 603-4.

[81] J. Neusner, *The Way of Torah*, p. xiii.

Here are some of the dates that Neusner provides as cornerstones of Jewish achievement, in the centuries following the Second Temple's demise:[82]

Table of dates

c. 80-110	Gamaliel heads academy at Yavneh Final canonization of Hebrew Scriptures Promulgation of Order of Prayer by rabbis
120	Akiba leads rabbinical movement
132-135	Bar Kokhba leads messianic war against Rome Southern Palestine devastated
c. 220	Babylonial academy founded at Sura by Rab
c. 250	Pact between Jews and Persian king, Shapur I: Jews to keep state law; Persians to permit Jews to govern selves, live by own religion
c. 300	Closure of the Tosefta, corpus of supplementary material in exegesis and amplification of the Mishnah
c. 330	Pumbedita school headed by Abbaye, then Raba, lays foundation of *Babylonian Talmud*
c. 400	Talmud of the land of Israel completed as a systematic commentary on four of the Mishnah's six divisions, in particular Agriculture, Seasons, Women, and Damages (omitted: Holy Things and Purities)
c. 400	Rab Ashi begins to shape *Babylonian Talmud*, which is completed by 600
630-640	Moslem conquest of Middle East
c. 700	Saboraim complete the final editing of *Babylonian Talmud* as a systematic commentary on four of the Mishnah's six divisions (excluded: Agriculture and Purities)

This table reveals that the complete loss of political power compelled Jews to begin an era of literary activity, with the establishment of various academies culminating in the compilation of the Mishna, Jerusalem Talmud and the Talmud Babylonia. In fact this last acquired its final shape in Islamic Iraq *c.* 700 C.E. or perhaps even later (since all dates aside from the Muslim conquest are approximate), maturing under the strong influence of Islamic *fiqh* which had taken hold in Iraq six decades earlier.

---

[82] *ibid*, pp. xxi-xxii. Neusner's claim that the final canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures occurred between 80-110 C.E. is wholly inaccurate. See pp. 289-92.

i. History of Torah According to Jewish Sources

A. MOSES DELIVERS THE TORAH TO LEVITES WHO PLACE IT BESIDE THE ARK

> 9 And Moses wrote this law, and delivered it unto the priests the sons of Levi, which bore the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and unto all the elders of Israel.
> 10 And Moses commanded them, saying, at the end of every seven years, in the solemnity of the year of release, in the feast of tabernacles,
> 11 When all Israel is come to appear before the Lord thy God in the place which he shall choose, thou shalt read this law before all Israel in their hearing.[4]
>
> 24 And it came to pass, when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished,
> 25 That Moses commanded the Levites, which bore the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying,
> 26 Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee.
> 27 For I know thy rebellion, and thy stiff neck: behold, while I am yet alive with you this day, ye have been rebellious against the Lord; and how much more after my death?
> 29 For I know that after my death ye will utterly corrupt yourselves, and turn aside from the way which I have commanded you; and evil will befall you in the latter days; because ye will do evil in the sight of the Lord, to provoke him to anger through the work of your hands.[5]

B. TORAH LOST AND REDISCOVERED

Proving the existence of the Torah and its usage prior to the Exile is very difficult. To quote Aaron Demsky:

> Another feature of the sabbatical year is the public reading of the Torah during the holiday of Booth (Tabernacles), which concludes the year (Deuteronomy 31:10-13). There is no textual evidence attesting to the observance of the sabbatical and jubilee years in First Temple times. In fact, the author of Chronicles... makes the claim that the 70 sabbatical years from the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites until the destruction of the Temple were not observed.[6]

---

[4] Deuteronomy 31:9-11.

[5] *ibid*, 31:24-29.

[6] A. Demsky, "Who Returned First: Ezra or Nehemiah", *Bible Review*, vol. xii, no. 2,

According to the Damascus document (of which seven copies were found in the Dead Sea Scrolls) the Lord gave the Torah to Moses in its entirety in written form. These writings were sealed in the Ark for approximately five centuries, however, and were therefore unknown to the masses. Discussing the puzzle of David's relationship with Bathsheba[7] and why he was not put to death, the Damascus document answers, "the books of the Law had been sealed in the Ark from the time of Joshua [*c.* 1200 B.C.E.] until the time of King Josiah of Judah [seventh century B.C.E.], when they were rediscovered and republished".[8] Meaning that David and the rabbis who were his contemporaries were completely unaware that adultery was a punishable offense, and indeed were oblivious to everything else that lay written in the Torah.

Whether we conjecture that the Torah was placed within the Ark or simply beside it, the subject is highly convoluted. The Ark itself was lost to the Philistines for seven months during the Philistine invasions (*c.* 1050-1020 B.C.E.); upon its recovery, fifty-thousand and seventy Israelites from the town of Beth-shemesh were wiped out by God for daring to peek into the Ark.[9] By the time King Solomon ordered that the Ark be moved to the First Temple, 1 Kings 8:9 informs us that its sole contents were the two tablets which Moses had brought back from Sinai—not the entire Law. Even if the Torah was housed separately from the Ark, it disappeared entirely from Jewish life for centuries. Seventy sabbatical years (five centuries), if not more, passed without any public recital of the Law, culminating in the introduction of foreign gods and pagan rites. A clear sign that the Torah had long since been erased from the nation's collective memory. Not until the eighteenth year of King Josiah's reign (640-609 B.C.E.) was the Torah 'miraculously rediscovered',[10] prompting the king's sweeping reforms against child sacrifice and other pagan rituals. But the Torah was still not in common use for another two centuries at least, disappearing from Jewish consciousness as abruptly as it appeared. There is strong evidence that the first reading and expounding of the Law to the general public (after Moses) did not occur until Ezra's promulgation *c.* 449 B.C.E. Note that this leaves a massive gap of over 170 years from the time of the Law's rediscovery in the Temple (621 B.C.E.) to Ezra's recital.[11]

April 1996, p. 33.

[7] For the story of Bathsheba see 2 Samuel 11.

[8] G.A. Anderson, "Torah Before Sinai – The Do's and Don'ts Before the Ten Commandments", *Bible Review*, vol. xii, no. 3, June 1996, p. 43. See also 2 Kings 22.

[9] See 1 Samuel 6:19.

[10] 2 Kings 23:2-10.

[11] *Dictionary of the Bible*, p.954.

ii. *History of the Torah According to Modern Scholars*

Let us start with a chronological outline of the OT books based upon generally accepted conclusions of biblical criticism. The following table is from C.H. Dodd, *The Bible To-day*.[12]

Note: the dates given are rather sketchy and seem inclined to shift up and down on occasion. Rowley has discussed the different trends in the dating of OT books,[13] but such discrepancies will not have much bearing on the outcome of this discussion.

Century B.C.E.		
XIII (or earlier?)	Exodus from Egypt	Oral traditions (laws, legends, poems) preserved in later writings.
XII (?)	Settlement in Palestine	
XI	Wars with Canaanites, *etc.* Foundation of Monarchy (David, 1000 B.C.E.)	
X	Court chronicles begin (incorporated in later books).	
IX	Early laws and traditions written down: Judean collection ('J') and Ephraimite collection ('E'), later incorporated in Genesis-to-Joshua.	
VIII	Amos, Hosea, Micah, Isaiah. (Fall of Samaria, 721 B.C.E.)	
VII	Josiah's Reformation, 621 B.C.E.: Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, Zephaniah, Nahum.	
VI	Habakkuk, Judges, Samuel, Kings. (Fall of Jerusalem, 586 B.C.E.). Ezekiel, 'II Isaiah', Haggai, Zechariah.	
V	'Priestly' laws and narratives of Genesis-to-Joshua ('P') written on basis of earlier traditions. Malachi, Job.	
IV	Compilation of Genesis-to-Joshua (out of 'J', 'E', 'P' and Deuteronomy).	
III	Chronicles, Ecclesiastes.	
II	Book of Psalms completed (largely out of much earlier poems). Ecclesiasticus, Daniel, *etc.*	
I	Book of Wisdom, *etc.*	

---

[12] C.H. Dodd, *The Bible To-day*, Cambridge University Press, 1952, p. 33.

[13] H.H. Rowley, *The OT and Modern Study*, Oxford University Press, 1961, p. xxvii.

The collection and codification of the ancient Israelite laws resulted in the so-called Pentateuch, or the Five Books of Moses (covering Genesis to Deuteronomy). According to C.H. Dodd these received their final shape around the fourth century B.C.E. The works of the prophets were also edited, with historical records often being altered in the interest of bringing them into line with the prophets' teachings.[14]

A. BIBLICAL SOURCES EDITED IN THE FIFTH TO SECOND CENTURY B.C.E. William G. Dever, Professor of Near Eastern Archaeology and Anthropology at the University of Arizona, presents another view. He contends that the biblical sources were edited in the late Persian (fifth-fourth centuries B.C.E.) and Hellenistic (third-second centuries B.C.E.) eras. And there are others such as Tom Thompson of Copenhagen, his colleague Niels Peter Lemche, Philip Davies of Sheffield, "and a number of other scholars, both American and European, who believe that the Hebrew Bible was not only edited in the Persian/Hellenistic periods but was written then".[15]

Meanwhile Professor Frederick Cryer of Copenhagen,

> concludes that the Hebrew Bible "cannot be shown to have achieved its present contents prior to the Hellenistic period". The people we call Israel did not use that term for themselves, he says, before the fourth century B.C.E. The Saul and David narratives, for example, were written under "the probable influence" of Hellenistic literature about Alexander the Great. That these Biblical texts were composed so late "necessarily forces us to lower our estimation of the work as an historical source".[16]

Niels Lemche has gone even further, tracing the conception of ancient Israel to "19th-century German historiography that saw all civilizations in terms of its own concept of the nation-state".[17] To him the social and political patterns of an ancient Israel are thus whimsical dreams born of Europe's own preoccupation with nation-statehood in the 1800s.[18]

---

[14] C.H. Dodd, *The Bible To-day*, pp. 59-60.

[15] H. Shanks, "Is This Man a Biblical Archaeologist?", *Biblical Archaeology Review*, July/August 1996, vol. 22, no. 4, p. 35.

[16] H. Shanks, "New Orleans Gumbo: Plenty of Spice at Annual Meeting", *Biblical Archaeology Review*, March/April 1997, vol. 23, no. 2, p. 58.

[17] *ibid*, p. 58.

[18] Muslims do not practice such cynicism. They must believe in the existence of David, Solomon, and the Torah as revealed to Moses (whose traces may lurk in some books of the OT).

2. The Sources of Jewish Literary Culture

i. Original Language of the Old Testament was Not Called Hebrew

The pre-exilic language used by Jews was a Canaanite dialect *not* known as Hebrew. The Phoenicians (or more accurately, the Canaanites) invented the first true alphabet *c.* 1500 B.C.E., based on letters instead of descriptive images. All successive alphabets are indebted to and derivative of this Canaanite accomplishment.[19]

> In general culture the Canaanites are no less remarkable, and not a little of that culture was taken over by the Hebrews.... The Hebrews were not great builders, nor very apt in the arts and crafts. As a result they had to rely heavily on the Canaanites in this field, and in others as well. *Whatever language the Hebrews spoke before settling in Palestine, it was a dialect of Canaanite that became their language after the settlement.*[20]

Some scholars believe that Hebrew and Aramaic are simply two dialects of Canaanite.[21] The pre-exilic Jewish script was in fact Canaanite,[22] although it is now falsely designated as old Hebrew or paleo-Hebrew. Abraham and his descendants formed too small a clan in Canaan to establish their own unique language, and by necessity they must have used the predominant Canaanite; it is very unlikely that the Israelites, present in such small numbers and forced to endure hardship and slavery in Egypt, were in a position conducive to setting up a new language. At best they may have adopted a particular Canaanite dialect, but certainly nothing separate and unique. In fact the OT itself never refers to the Jewish language as Hebrew, as illustrated by these two verses from Isaiah 36:

> 11 Then said Eliakim and Shebna and Joah unto Rab-shakeh, Speak, I pray thee, unto thy servants in the Syrian language; for we understand *it*: and speak not to us in the Jews' language, in the ears of the people that *are* on the wall.
>
> 13 Then Rab-shakeh stood, and cried with a loud voice in the Jews' language, and said, Hear ye the words of the great king, the king of Assyria.

Such is the rendering in the *King James Version.* The same phrase is found in the *New World Translation*,[23] the *Holy Bible from the Ancient Eastern Text*,[24] the *Revised Standard Version*[25] and the Arabic Edition. These last three substitute 'Aramaic' for 'Syrian language', but none of them designates the other as Hebrew.[26] 2 Kgs 18:26 and 2 Ch 32:18 chronicle the same incident and incorporate the same expression. In another chapter of Isaiah we read:

> In that day shall five cities in the land of Egypt speak the language of Canaan, and swear to the Lord of hosts; one shall be called, The city of destruction.[27]

The above translations unanimously agree on this phrasing. Had Hebrew existed as a distinct language at the time, the OT would bear testimony to it instead of a blank reference to the 'Jews' language' or the 'language of Canaan'.[28] Given that the text alludes to the language of Canaan generically – which, simply put, is Canaanite – we can infer that the Israelites did not possess a unique tongue at the time of the Divided Kingdoms of Israel and Judah.

In fact the word 'Hebrew' was indeed in existence, but it predated the Israelites and did not signify anything remotely Jewish. The words *'Ibri* (Habiru) and *'Ibrani* (Hebrew) were in usage even before 2000 B.C.E. and referred to a group of Arab tribes from the northern reaches of the Arabian Peninsula, in the Syrian desert. The appellation spread to other Arab tribes in the area until it became a synonym for 'son of the desert'. Cuneiform and Pharaonic texts from before the Israelites also use such words as *'Ibri, Habiri, Habiru, Khabiru,* and *'Abiru.* In this sense the term *'Ibrani,* as ascribed to Abraham in the Bible, means a member of the *'Abiru* (or nomadic Arab tribes), of which he was a member. The phrase *'Ibrit,* denoting Jews, was coined later on by the rabbis in Palestine.[29]

ii. The Early Jewish Script: Canaanite and Assyrian

The pre-exilic Jewish script was Canaanite.[30] When Aramaic became the predominant tongue of the ancient Near East, the Jews adopted this language and soon assumed its script as well – which was then known as Assyrian.[31]

---

[19] Isrā'īl Wilfinson, *Tārīkh al-Lugāt as-Sāmiyya (History of Semitic Languages)*, Dār al-Qalam, Beirut, Lebanon, P.O. Box 3874, ND, p. 54. Cited thereafter as Wilfinson.

[20] *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 121; italics added.

[21] Wilfinson, p. 75.

[22] Wilfinson, p. 91.

[23] *New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures*, Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc., 1984.

[24] George M. Lamsa's translation from the Aramaic of the Peshitta, Harper, San Francisco.

[25] Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1952.

[26] The *Revised Standard Version* uses "language of Judah".

[27] *KJV*, Isaiah 19:18.

[28] Of all the Bibles in my collection only the *CEV* explicitly writes Hebrew in Isaiah 19:18, Isaiah 36:11-13, 2 K 18:26, and 2 Ch 32:18. But the accuracy of this work is highly suspect, see pp. 326 - 27.

[29] Wilfinson, pp. 73-79.

[30] *ibid*, p. 91.

> This ירושא בתכ or simply תירושא 'Assyrian script' was so called because it was the originally Aramean form of the 'Phoenician script' which had been coming into use... since the 8th century B.C. and which was brought back by Jews returning from the Exile. The 'square script' (עברמ בתכ) was derived from this form of the alphabet.[32]

This square script was not formally designated as Hebrew until the writings of Bin Sira and Josephus in the first century C.E., and in the Mishna and Talmud,[33] all of which are very late developments.

So which language *was* the OT originally written in? From the information above we see a process of scriptural evolution: Canaanite, Aramaic (Assyrian), and finally square, which later on was renamed Hebrew. We can conclude that, prior to their return from the Babylonian Exile in 538 B.C.E., Jews did not have any means of written communication distinctly their own. Interestingly Würthwein annexes the Canaanite alphabet by declaring, "This was the *Phoenician-Old Hebrew* script, the ancestor of all the alphabets of past and present".[34] This is quite frankly meaningless in light of the above history.

iii. The Sources of the Torah

A. JEWISH SOURCES

Just as it remains fashionable to search for ulterior influences in the Qur'ān (a subject I will tackle later),[35] Western scholars busied themselves in the past with finding sources for the Torah. Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918) points out four basic origins: **J** (the Yahwistic Prophetic narrative,

---

[31] Ernst Würthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament*, 2nd Edition, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1995, pp. 1-2. Cited thereafter as Würthwein.

[32] *ibid*, p. 2, footnote 4.

[33] Wilfinson, p. 75.

[34] Würthwein, p. 2. Italics added. There is yet another twist to this history of fabrications. Now in Wadi el-Hol in Egypt, near Luxor, a 'Semitic inscription' dated somewhere between 1900 and 1800 B.C.E. has been discovered by Dr. Darnells and his wife Deborah. The director of the West Semitic Research Project at the University of California, Dr. Zuckermann, traveled to the spot to take detailed pictures of the inscription [J.N. Wilford, "Discovery of Egyptian Inscriptions Indicates an Earlier Date for Origin of the Alphabet", *The New York Times*, Nov. 13, 1999]. As the word 'Semitic' is nowadays reserved exclusively for Jews (rather than Arabs or Arameans), it appears that the credit for inventing the alphabet may gradually be taken away from the Phoenicians and given to the ancient Israelites.

[35] See Chapter 19.

c. 850 B.C.); **E** (the Elohistic Prophetic narrative, *c.* 750 B.C.); **D** (Deuteronomy and Deuteronomic notes elsewhere, *c.* 600 B.C.); and **P** (the Priestly Code, represented especially in Leviticus and in reformations elsewhere, *c.* 400 B.C.).[36] Other supposedly Jewish sources have also been found.

B. NON-JEWISH SOURCES

The greatest dilemma we face however is the discovery of similar writings in non-Jewish sources—some preceding the OT by at least five centuries. According to Ex 20, God verbally proclaimed the Ten Commandments and wrote them on two stone tablets, presenting these to Moses on Mount Sinai.

> The most famous parallel corpus is, of course, the Code of Hammurabi ... (dated at *c.* 1700 B.C.). *So striking is the similarity that at first statements were made to the effect that the Covenant Code was taken or borrowed from Hammurabi's laws.* Now it is understood that both codes stem from a common background of wide-spread legislation. Though the Hebrew code is later in date, it is in some ways simpler and more primitive in character than that of Hammurabi...[37]

Another intriguing find stems from writings found in Ras Shamra, in present-day Syria. Quoting the National Geographic Magazine:

> Even Adam and Eve are mentioned in the Ras Shamra texts. They lived in a magnificent garden in the East, a rather vague address, which, however, corresponds to that given in the Bible.... In the story as written by the Ugarit author, Adam was the founder of a nation, the Canaan Semites, probably one of the oldest sheiks or kings, and therefore apparently a historic personality.[38]

These slates, according to the author, date from the 14th or 15th century B.C.E. and therefore predate Moses by at least one hundred years.

3. History of the Oral Law

Rabbinical teaching dictates that the Written Law (the Five Books of Moses) and the Oral Law (delivered for centuries by word of mouth) both originated at the time of Moses; the latter provided all the necessary explanations for implementing the former. The Mishnah is a compilation of this Oral Law.[39]

---

[36] *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 104.

[37] *ibid*, p. 568; italics added. The Book of the Covenant or Covenant Code is roughly Ex 20:22-23:19 [*ibid*, p. 568]. Fredrick Delitzsch, the founding father of Assyriology, in his works *Babel and Bible* and *Die Grosse Täuschung* has shown that the sources for Israelite faith, religion and society were mainly derived from Babylonian sources. [See S. Bunimovitz, "How Mute Stones Speak: Interpreting What We Dig Up", *Biblical Archaeology Review*, March/April 1995, vol. 21, no. 2, p. 61.]

[38] C.F.A. Schaeffer, "Secrets from Syrian Hills", *The National Geographic Magazine*, vol. lxiv, no. 1, July 1933, pp. 125-6.

> The Mishnah's own account of the origin and history of the Oral Law is given in the tractate Aboth, 1. At the same time that the Written Law was given from Sinai, the Oral Law, too, was delivered to Moses, and handed down (orally) in turn to the leaders of successive generations.[40]

Below is the tractate Aboth, 1, containing the traditional history of the Oral Law:

> 1. Moses received the Law from Sinai and committed it to Joshua, and Joshua to the elders, and the elders to the Prophets; and the Prophets committed it to the men of the Great Synagogue. They said three things: Be deliberate in judgement, raise up many disciples, and make a fence around the Law.
> 2. Simeon the Just[41] was of the remnants of the Great Synagogue ....
> 3. Antigonus of Soko received [the Law] from Simeon the Just ....
> 4. Jose b. Joezer of Zeredah and Jose b. Johanan of Jerusalem received [the Law] from them ....[42]

And so on. "Excepting the last four paragraphs the sayings are anonymous."[43]

This traditional account of the Oral Law, of its transmission from Moses in an unbroken chain to the rabbis of post-Exile Jerusalem, is easily disproved by a glance at Jewish history. The discovery of a 'Book of the Law' during King Josiah's reign (640-609 B.C.E.) prompted wide-ranging reforms.[44] The nature of these – purging the Temple of heathen altars, eliminating child sacrifices, destroying the pagan house of male prostitutes, and so on – bears witness that even the most obvious fundamentals of the Law had been wiped clean from Israelite consciousness. The extent of these practices belies the existence of Jewish teachers who were supposedly memorizing and transmitting the Oral Law for centuries. The Oral traditions are clearly

---

[39] *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 954.

[40] Herbert Danby (trans), *The Mishnah*, Introduction, Oxford Univ. Press, 1933, p. xvii.

[41] Either Simeon son of Onias, High Priest *c.* 280 B.C., or Simeon II, High Priest *c.* 200 B.C.

[42] H. Danby (trans), *The Mishnah*, p. 446.

[43] *ibid*, p. 446, footnote no. 1.

[44] *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 382.

an exponent of the Written Law; even if the latter had disappeared, any faithful preservation of the former, orally, would have sufficiently informed rabbis that such pagan rituals constituted sacrilege. Where were the religious leaders who were transmitting the Law generation after generation? Indeed Josiah's grandfather, King Manasseh, thought that by restoring the altars to Baal which Hezekiah had destroyed, he was "returning to the early worship of the nation, and the Baal whom he worshiped was probably identified in the minds of the people with the national God Yahweh".[45]

Whatever the form of Oral Law originally received by Moses, it was lost several millennia ago and no longer exists. The current Oral Law,

> probably dates from the time when the Written Law was first read and expounded to the people [by Ezra]. This oral expounding inevitably led to differing explanations. Hence in later times it was necessary to reduce to writing the explanations considered authoritative and correct. This process began in the time of Hillel and Shammai (end of 1st century B.C.) and came to be called *mishnah* .... Frequently, each teacher would compile his own Mishnah.[46]

Bereft of any original source from which to draw, and given that disputes over meaning led individual teachers to compile their own Oral Law, how valid then is the Mishnah (Rabbi Judah ha-Nasi's redaction) which survives today? On what methodological basis did it supersede all others?

4. History of the Hebrew Text: The Masorah

The OT's Hebrew text is termed Masoretic because in its present form it is based on the Masorah, the textual tradition of the Jewish scholars known as the Masoretes.

> The Masorah (Hebr. "tradition") refers to the system of vowel signs, accent markings, and marginal notes devised by *early medieval* Jewish scribes and scholars and used in copying the text of the Hebrew Bible in order to guard it from changes.[47]

i. Only Thirty-One Surviving Masoretic Texts of the OT

The Masoretic text (MT) alludes to the end product, a text wherein the vowel-less, consonantal body of the Hebrew Bible was adorned with vowel and accent marks in the early Middle Ages. The total number of Hebrew Bibles written in Masoretic form (either complete or fragmentary) is only 31, dating from the late 9th century to 1100 C.E.[48] The symbol 𝔐 designates the Masoretic text in both the Biblia Hebraica edited by Rudolf Kittel (BHK) and the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (BHS).[49] These constitute the most critical editions of the OT and are highly revered; in fact they both represent the text of the same manuscript, B 19A, in the Saltykov-Shchedrin State Public Library of St. Petersburg, written in 1008 C.E.[50]

---

[45] *ibid*, p. 616.

[46] *ibid*, p. 954.

[47] *Oxford Companion to the Bible*, p. 500; emphasis added.

Figure 16.1: Sample page from the Leningrad Codex. The shown folio covers Genesis 12:1B-13:7A. Note the lack of separators (markers) between chapters as well as verses. Reprinted with the publisher's kind permission.

---

[48] *ibid*, p. 501.

[49] Würthwein, p. 10.

[50] *ibid*, p. 10. A facsimile of this manuscript has been published: *The Leningrad Codex: A Facsimile Edition*, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1998.

One remarkable aspect of the Leningrad Codex, as it is known, is its dating system. V. Lebedev states,

> The manuscript begins with a large colophon, which gives the date of the manuscript copy, cited in five different eras: 4770 from Creation, 1444 from King Jehoiachin's exile, 1319 from 'Greek dominion' (*malkut ha-yawanim*), 940 from the destruction of the second Temple of Jerusalem, and 399 from Hijrah (*qeren ze'irah*). The month is Siwan.[51]

One comment worthy of note here comes from Würthwein, that "verse divisions were already known in the Talmudic period, with differing Babylonian and Palestinian traditions".[52] By lacking any form of separation between verses, this medieval codex (written so many centuries after Talmudic times) casts a pall on Würthwein's assertion. Moreover, verse separators were not given numbers as subdivisions of chapters until the 16th century, while the division of the Hebrew text into chapters was adopted from the Latin Vulgate two centuries earlier.[53]

The Leningrad Codex is alarmingly recent given the age of the OT. The oldest existing Hebrew manuscript of the entire OT hails, in fact, from only the 10th century C.E.[54]

> A number of substantially earlier Hebrew manuscripts, some dating from the pre-Christian era, were hidden during the first and second centuries A.D.[55] in various caves in the Judean desert … near the Dead Sea and remained there for nearly two millennia, to be found in a succession of discoveries beginning in 1947.[56]

These findings include fragments from nearly all the OT books, but for a full copy of the OT scholars are still entirely dependent on manuscripts dating from the 10th century and onwards.[57]

5. In Search of an Authoritative Text

It is well known that for many centuries the Hebrew text of the Old Testament existed as a purely consonantal text. Vowel signs

---

[51] V.V. Lebedev, "The Oldest Complete Codex of the Hebrew Bible", *The Leningrad Codex: A Facsimile Edition*, pp. xxi-xxii. The codex bears no Christian date because, even up to that point, there was no calendar system based on Jesus.

[52] Würthwein, p. 21.

[53] *ibid*, p. 21.

[54] *ibid*, pp. 10-11. More accurately it should be assigned to the early 11th century as the Leningrad Codex bears a copying date of 1008 C.E. [*ibid*, p. 10].

[55] These dates are baseless; see pp. 289 - 92.

[56] Würthwein, p. 11.

[57] *ibid*, p. 11.

> were not added to the text until a later stage, when the consonantal text was already well established with a long history of transmission behind it.[58]

The history of the various textual variations, the subsequent inclusion of vowels, and the final emergence of an authoritative text, require detailed scrutiny.

i. The Role of the Council of Jamnia - Late First Century C.E.

Würthwein writes,

> The consonantal text which is preserved in the medieval manuscripts and forms the basis of our present editions goes back to about A.D. 100. As part of the great Jewish revival which marked the decades after the catastrophe of A.D.70, *the canonical status of certain disputed books of the Old Testament was defined at the Council of Jamnia (late first century A.D.), and an authoritative text of the Old Testament was also established.*[59]

The text preserved after the Second Temple's destruction in 70 C.E. was simply that of the most influential group, the Pharisees. The text types supported by lesser groups disappeared, making the current standard text a result of historical development and evolution.[60] Würthwein's claim, that the Council of Jamnia established an authoritative text, is merely wishful thinking as it contradicts his statement elsewhere that the OT text was finally established in the tenth century C.E.[61]

ii. The Old Testament Text was known in a Variety of Differing Traditions

A false impression has been created among general readers that the OT has been transmitted through the ages exactly character for character, word for word.[62] Such is hardly the case; even the Ten Commandments differ in two versions.[63]

Scholars concur that towards the end of the pre-Christian era, the OT text was known in a variety of traditions that differed from each other to varying degrees. Attempts to resolve this puzzle of multiple text types have lead scholars to propose conflicting theories. "Frank M. Cross would interpret them as local Palestinian, Egyptian, and Babylonian textual forms,"[64] meaning that each of these centers nurtured its own OT text, independent of whatever textual forms other centers were using. Shemaryahu Talmon objects to Cross' theory and believes instead that "the ancient authors, compilers, tradents and scribes enjoyed what may be termed a controlled freedom of textual variation .... *From the very first stage of its manuscript transmission, the Old Testament text was known in a variety of traditions which differed from each other to a greater or less degree*".[65] So whereas Cross endorses the view of each center establishing its own form of the text, Talmon argues that the variations are due not to different centers but to the compilers and scribes themselves, who *from the start* exercised a limited freedom in re-shaping the text. Whatever the answer may be, the existence of different textual forms is irrefutable.

iii. Approximately 6000 Discrepancies Between the Samaritan and Jewish Pentateuchs Alone

A separate religious and ethnic Hebrew sect, the Samaritans proclaimed Moses as their sole prophet and the Torah as their only Holy Book, the perfect recension of which they insisted they possessed to the exclusion of Jews.[66] The exact date of the Samaritans' split from the Jews remains unknown, but most likely occurred during the Maccabean Dynasty (166-63 B.C.E.) with the ravaging of Shechem and the Mount Gerizim sanctuary.[67]

> The problem of the Samaritan Pentateuch is that it differs from [the Masoretic Hebrew text] in some six thousand instances. ... [Many] are trivial and do not affect the meaning of the text, yet it is significant that in about nineteen hundred instances [the Samaritan Pentateuch agrees with the Septuagint[68] against the Masoretic text]. Some of the variants in [the Samaritan Pentateuch] must be

---

[58] *ibid*, p. 12.

[59] *ibid*, p. 13. Italics added.

[60] *ibid*, p. 14.

[61] See pp. 282 - 83.

[62] See "Are Torah Scrolls Exactly the Same?", *Bible Review*, vol. xiii, no. 6, Dec. 1997, pp. 5-6.

[63] See for instance Würthwein's analysis of the Nash Papyrus [Würthwein, p. 34].

[64] Würthwein, pp.14-15.

[65] *ibid*, pp.14-15. Italics added.

[66] *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 880. Recension is the process of examining all available manuscripts, and forming a text based on the most trustworthy evidence.

[67] Würthwein, p. 45.

[68] The Septuagint refers to the Old Testament as translated into Greek, supposedly during the third century B.C.E., and used by Jews living in the Greek diaspora to read their Scriptures in the language most familiar to them. Würthwein writes that "what we find in [the Septuagint] is not a single version but a collection of versions made by various writers who differed greatly in their translation methods, their knowledge of Hebrew, their styles, and in other ways" [*ibid*, pp. 53-4].

> regarded as alterations introduced by the Samaritans in the interest of their own cult. This is true especially of the command inserted after Exod. 20:17 to build a sanctuary on Mount Gerizim, of Deut. 11:30 where םכש לומ is added to הוקמ (אוממ), and of nineteen passages in Deuteronomy where the choice of the holy place is set in the past and the reference to Shechem is made clear.[69]

One is certainly tempted to question how many of these 6000 discrepancies are due to Samaritan alterations, and how many to Jewish ones. As we will see in p. 282, no single authoritative version of the OT existed prior to *at least* the first century C.E., let alone an authoritative version that was being transmitted with any appreciable degree of fidelity. Infer, at least in the nineteen hundred instances of agreement between the Septuagint and Samaritan against the Masoretic, that the Jews altered this last text. The Septuagint came about in the 3rd century B.C.E. under the direction (according to traditional sources) of six translators from each of the twelve tribes of Israel.[70] So a minimum of three or four centuries separates the Septuagint from the earliest possible date for an authoritative edition of the OT. Based on the deep-rooted enmity between Jews and Samaritans, and the latter's insistence that they alone possessed the perfect recension, the probability of a Samaritan effort aimed at changing their Pentateuch to conform to the Jewish Septuagint seems very remote indeed. Clearly the logical conclusion is one of corruption in the Masoretic text in those nineteen hundred instances, after the 3rd century B.C.E., to say nothing of the corruptions prior to that date which must have been incorporated into the Septuagint.

iv. Unintentional Corruptions of the Text

Errors can creep into a text from every conceivable avenue, as even the most careful copyist will attest. Most are unintentional. In connection with this OT scholars have devised their own vocabulary to catalogue such mental lapses. Delving into the most common categories we find: confusion of similar characters (such as ב and ה ,כ and ח); dittography (accidental repetition); haplography (accidental omission when a character is present as a doublet in a word); homoioteleuton (omission when two words have identical endings and the scribe skips from the first to the second, omitting everything in between); errors due to vowels, and more.[71] When perusing text-critical research, it is not unusual to find a modern-day author invoking homoioteleuton (for example) to dispel the notion that an error was deliberate on the scribe's part; this may be proffered as an explanation even if the same omission is present in other important manuscripts.[72]

v. No Qualms Felt in Altering the Text for Doctrinal Reasons

We must be more concerned with intentional alterations however, as they are naturally far more serious. Until the Middle Ages the text of the OT was not yet established,[73] and "before the text of the Old Testament was officially established, it was not regarded as unalterable".[74] Therefore the scribes and transmitters occasionally made deliberate alterations which, regardless of their intentions, served in a very real sense to corrupt the original text. Parallel manuscripts demonstrate that not even the Masoretic text, intended to safeguard the OT from further changes, was immune to this phenomenon.[75]

> Yet the restoration of the early traditional text, reconstructing and preserving it even where it was open to criticism, is only one of the marks of (rabbinic) occupation with the [Masoretic] text. *A second mark reveals an opposite tendency. There is clear evidence that no qualms were felt in altering the text when there appeared to be adequate doctrinal reasons.*[76]

What were some of these pressing doctrinal reasons? Occasionally they were merely linguistic, changing an esoteric word into a more common synonym. Other times, the removal of religiously offensive wording or (most serious of all) the insertion of certain words to champion one possible interpretation of a verse over all others.[77] Jewish tradition preserved a partial record of these textual alterations in notes known as the *Tiqqune sopherim* and the *Itture sopherim,*[78] which must of course be relatively late works.

a) The *Tiqqune sopherim* catalogue some of the textual revisions carried out for doctrinal reasons. One Masoretic tradition, for example, mentions eighteen positions where the text was altered to remove "objectionable expressions referring to God".[79]

---

[69] *ibid*, p. 46. Version symbols have been translated and are placed inside square brackets.

[70] For a total of 72 translators. 'Septuagint' translates to 'The Version of the Seventy' and is commonly denoted LXX [*Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 347].

[71] Würthwein, pp. 108-110.

[72] See Würthwein, p. 154.

[73] See pp. 282 - 83.

[74] Würthwein, p. 111.

[75] *ibid*, p. 111.

[76] *ibid*, p. 17. Italics added.

[77] *ibid*, pp. 111-112.

[78] *ibid*, p. 17.

[79] *ibid*, p. 17.

b) The *Itture sopherim* catalogue some of the various words in the original text which were deliberately omitted by scribes. For instance, the Babylonian Talmud (*Ned.* 37b) names five passages where certain words in the text are to be skipped over, and another seven passages where particular words are to be read even though they are not in the original.[80]

The existence of these traditions is simply one aspect, we can safely assume, of a far more elaborate process.[81]

vi. No Single Authoritative OT Text Existed Till 100 C.E.

Some manuscripts from Qumran (source of the Dead Sea Scrolls) are quite close to the Masoretic text as finalized in the Middle Ages.

> But despite *all* the superficial similarities there is one decisive difference: the Qumran text of the Masoretic type was only one of several different types in common use... and there is no indication that it was regarded as more authoritative than the others. We may infer that for Qumran, and evidently for the rest of Judaism as well, *there was not yet a single authoritative text.*[82]

Only during the ensuing Jewish revival did one text type gain prominence, eclipsing the others that had remained in circulation prior to the first century C.E. In fact the Qumran caves contain three distinct text types: the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Septuagint, and the Masoretic text. Würthwein states that the last of these three must have risen to authority sometime between 70-135 C.E.,[83] though this conclusion is based on the erroneous dating of several caves in Qumran and Wadī Murabbaʿāt, as I shall explain on pp. 289-92.

vii. Jewish Scholars Established the Text of the OT in the Tenth Century, Actively Destroying Earlier Manuscripts

> Jewish regulations required the destruction of worn and defective manuscripts. And when scholars had finally established the text in the tenth century, *all older manuscripts which represented earlier stages of its development were naturally considered defective*, and in the course of time they disappeared.[84]

---

[80] *ibid*, p. 18.

[81] *ibid*, p. 18.

[82] *ibid*, p. 14. Italics added.

[83] *ibid*, p. 14.

[84] *ibid*, p. 11. Italics added.

The choice of a single text type in the 10th century coincides with the introduction of the Masorah – the system of vowel signs and accent markings used as a check against further changes. This system, along with the purging of 'defective' manuscripts, was easier to implement once the major Jewish colony in Babylonia (the Eastern schools of Sura, Nehardea and Purnbeditha) had lost its significance and melted away by the 10th and 11th centuries.

> Once again the West assumed the spiritual leadership of Judaism, *and the Western Masoretes sought to eliminate all traces of textual traditions that differed from their own.* The views of the [Western] school of Tiberias became determinative for the future, and the Eastern tradition was forgotten for a millennium.[85]

These pivotal Hebrew manuscripts from the 10th and 11th centuries, incorporating the Masorah and finalizing the text type for all future generations, are exceedingly rare; they number only 31 and most are fragmentary.[86]

viii. The Masorah and Textual Integrity

With one particular text type chosen above all others, the textual freedom previously granted had to be replaced with stringency. Such was the function of the Masorah, comments Würthwein. He quotes Rabbi Akiba's statement that,

> "The Masora is a (protective) fence about the Law." This was the purpose of the scribes' meticulous work. They counted the verses, words, and letters of the Law and other parts of the Scriptures as a procedural aid in monitoring manuscripts and in checking their accuracy.[87]

Rabbi Akiba's statement is not entirely clear: certainly the counting of verses and letters was impractical in his time (*c.* 55-137 C.E.), and most likely did not take place until the late 9th and early 10th centuries when the Masorah system made its first true appearance. Würthwein himself remarks:

> We should therefore assume that when the consonantal text was established *ca.* A.D. 100, it did not result in the immediate suppression

---

[85] *ibid*, p. 12. Italics added.

[86] See pp. 275 - 76.

[87] Würthwein, p. 19. Würthwein qualifies himself in the footnote: "It is not certain, however, whether in Rabbi Akiba's statement (*Pirqe Aboth* 3:13) the word 'Masora' refers to the activities of textual transmission, as it is usually understood.... R. Akiba would mean that the Tradition of the Fathers (the Oral Law) was intended to prevent the violation of the Written Law". [p. 18, footnote 24.]

> of all other forms of the text, but that manuscripts with variant texts continued to circulate for a long time, especially in private hands. *The impressive unity of tenth-century and later manuscripts* is due... to the work of the earlier and later Masoretes who championed the established text and assisted it to victory over all the variant forms of the text.[88]

It is clear from Würthwein's own words that this impressive unity of text was achieved in the 10th century C.E. and later, *not* in the first century C.E.

6. The Jewish Revival: a Legacy of Islamic Literary Advancements

i. Pointing and Vocalization Induced by Islamic Achievements

> In the matter of vocalization...there was no written tradition of symbols [*i.e.* diacritical marks, or 'pointing'] for indicating the pronunciation or intonation of a text. It is not known when pointing originated.[89]

Initial claims that written signs for vocalization were founded in the 5th century C.E. have now been discarded. Noting that the Babylonian Talmud contains no references to pointing, Bruno Chiesa places the date between 650-750 C.E. But in this he assumes that the Babylonian Talmud was completed around 600, which amounts to little more than personal guesswork, and all he can really infer is that pointing began afterwards, not any sort of precise date. Indeed, the *Dictionary of the Bible* suggests 500, while Neusner maintains that the final editing of only four parts (out of six) was finished *c.* 700. Basing the start of pointing on the completion of the Babylonian Talmud is therefore hopeless. Moshe Goshen-Gottstein,

> assumes a time around A.D. 700 as probable. He believes the invention of vowel signs and accents was induced by the Islamic conquests which threatened to extinguish the tradition of precise liturgical recitation.[90]

That vowels were invented as a reaction to the threat of Islamic invasion is silly. Far more realistic is that they were inspired by and derived from the Arabic vowel system, which was coming into widespread recognition at the time due to the spread of Islam.

---

[88] *ibid*, p. 20; emphasis added.

[89] *ibid*, p. 21.

[90] *ibid*, p. 21.

> Eventually from the seventh century A.D. a system of vowel signs written above and below the consonants was adopted, *patterned perhaps after Syriac usage.* This system was called 'pointing,' from the Jewish technical term.[91]

I deliberated this point at length in Chapter 10.[92] Despite an active university in Nisibis, along with colleges and monasteries established since 450 C.E., the Syrians failed to invent diacritical marks until 700 C.E. Moreover Ḥunain b. Isḥāq (194-260 A.H./810-873 C.E.), the father of Syriac grammar, was a student of one of the pupils of the famous Arab grammarian al-Khalīl b. Aḥmad al-Frāhīdī (100-170 A.H./718-786 C.E.). This compelling sequence shows pointing to be a Muslim invention which, once adopted by the Syrians, then passed on to the Jews.

> The date at which the vowels were attached to the consonants of the Hebrew text can be determined only within broad limits. Neither the Talmud (*c.* A.D. 500) nor Jerome (A.D. 420) knows anything about the written vocalization. C.D. Ginsburg says that introduction of the graphic signs took place *c.* A.D. 650-680 and that the work of the Massoretes was complete about A.D. 700.[93]

Though I have reservations about the accuracy of these dates, I must note that they (as suggested) correspond perfectly with the dawn of Islam. One major concern nevertheless lies in the *accuracy* of the pointing system, since,

> more than a millennium separates the Masoretes of Tiberias from the days when Hebrew was a living national language, and it is altogether probable that the pronunciation of Hebrew had undergone some change in this interval, especially considering that it was written without vowels.... It would seem necessary, then, to expect a fair number of artificial forms in the Tiberian system, related to the Masoretes' desire to produce a correct pronunciation which made them *susceptible to such outside influences as Syriac and Islamic philology.*[94]

ii. Masoretic Activity Flourished in the West Under Islamic Influence

> Masoretic activity flourished again in the West in the period A.D. 780-930, evidently stimulated by Karaite influence.... A new Tiberian system was created, based on the experience of the Palestinian system,

---

[91] *ibid*, p. 22; italics added.

[92] See pp. 160 - 63.

[93] *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 972.

[94] Würthwein, pp. 26-7. Italics added.

7. Establishing the Date for a Fixed, Authoritative OT Text

i. Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Western View

Certainly the most significant biblical event of recent times has been the discovery of manuscripts at Qumran and Wadī Murabba'āt, near the Dead Sea, starting in 1947. Several centuries older than any material which scholars previously possessed, and coming from an era when no single form of the text was considered absolutely authoritative, these manuscripts have spawned a frenzy of interest.[103] Progress has been made, to the satisfaction of most biblical scholars, concerning the authenticity and age of these documents. The Qumran cave is closely associated with the settlement of Khirbet Qumran, which was razed in 68 C.E. during the First Jewish revolt, and archaeological examination of relics found in the cave places them roughly within this period. A piece of linen, for example, has been dated via Carbon-14 to somewhere between 167 B.C.E. and 233 C.E. Excavations to the site have thus concluded it most probable that the manuscripts in Qumran were deposited during this First Jewish revolt of 66-70 C.E.[104]

The second set of caves, in Wadī Murabba'āt, have their own history. This tale begins in the autumn of 1951 when Bedouins discovered four caves in an area almost twenty kilometers south of Qumran. Subsequent excavations revealed that "the caves had been inhabited repeatedly from 4000 B.C. to the Arabian period".[105] Several of the documents found within indicated that these caves had served as refuge for insurgents during the Second Jewish revolt. Fragmented scrolls of the OT were uncovered in these caves as well, though the script was more advanced than that found in Qumran; in fact, the text in these scrolls was very akin to that of the Masorah (*i.e.* the text type that eventually displaced all others and formed the basis for the OT as it exists today).[106] Western consensus holds that these manuscripts "may be dated with certainty at the time of the [Second Jewish revolt] (A.D. 132-135)".[107] Among the finds is a Minor Prophets scroll which dates (according to J.T. Milik) from the second century C.E., though the script is so advanced that it even bears "striking similarities to the script of medieval manuscripts.... The text is in almost complete agreement

---

[103] Würthwein, pp. 31-32.

[104] *ibid*, p. 31.

[105] *ibid*, p. 164.

[106] *ibid*, p. 31, footnote 56.

[107] *ibid*, p. 31, footnote 56. I have yet to find the proof behind this 'certainty'.

with [the Masoretic text type], suggesting that an authoritative standard text already existed in the first half of the second century A.D."[108]

Having highlighted Würthwein's own contradictory remarks, wherein he shifts from proclaiming the Wadī Murraba'āt scrolls as authoritative to stating that no authoritative text existed before the 10th century C.E., in this next section I will focus my arguments against the validity of the Qumran and Wadī Murraba'āt *termina datum*,[109] presenting the necessary evidence.

ii. The Counter View: The Termina Datum of Qumran and Other Caves is False

Western scholars claim that where the recovered fragments *disagree* with the Masoretic text, they must have been deposited in Qumran prior to the First Jewish revolt (66-70 C.E.), since that is when the nearby town of Khirbet Qumran was decimated by Roman troops. Fragments *agreeing* with the Masoretic text come from the cave at Wadī Murraba'āt, which was sealed after the Bar Kochba (Second Jewish) revolt in 135 C.E. Thus the inference is that the text of the OT was standardized sometime between 70-135 C.E.

But the very basis for this conclusion is false, as we can discern from the following two points:

- The caves were never made inaccessible, for the obvious reason that a young Bedouin discovered the scrolls without any digging. The Bedouin in question, Muḥammad Dhi'b, was fifteen at the time and either a shepherd or a smuggler, venturing off in search of a lost sheep or whilst taking shelter from the rain. Joined soon after by his friends, their cursory exploration yielded sight of the Dead Sea Scrolls. They had no recourse to any shovels or axes (let alone more sophisticated gear), but their hands proved sufficient and they visited the cave more than once to retrieve all the parchments. It may even be that they entered the cave barefoot. Though the caves were supposedly sealed in 135 C.E., this in no way guarantees that the site was inaccessible given how easily and coincidentally the scrolls were discovered. With this in mind we can conclude that the scrolls may well have been deposited at any time, and that the suggested *terminum datum* of 135 C.E.[110] has no legitimacy.

---

[108] *ibid*, p. 164.

[109] The 'terminal dates', signifying the cut-off points after which no further parchments were deposited in these caves.

[110] See Würthwein, p. 164.

- Reviewing a book titled *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert,*[111] H. Shanks writes that two of the authors (Cross and Davila) believe one of the Genesis fragments they studied came, not from Qumran as they were originally informed, but from Wadī Murabbaʿāt.

> Cross and Davila base their suspicious not only on a paleographical analysis of the script, but on the fact that the leather is coarse and poorly prepared, unlike the Qumran manuscripts. Davila tells us that the Bedouin may have inadvertently mixed up this manuscript with their [Qumran] finds.[112]

This suspicion is furthered by an artifact (a piece of linen) supposedly taken from Qumran, but which a recent Carbon-14 test revealed came from Wadī Murabbaʿāt, leading Shanks to wonder, "What else did the Bedouin mix up?"[113]

Conclusively proving which scroll belongs to which cave is therefore tremendously difficult. Archaeology is not a precise science; a great many things can easily be interpreted one way or another.[114] Additionally, different carbon dating protocols do result in conflicting data (sometimes by centuries), so the accuracy of such tests remains suspect.

Yet the greatest problem one faces in dating these caves is the existence of Arabic fragments found in the same cave of Wadī Murrabaʿāt, or very close by (one hesitates to accept in good faith which fragments come from which caves). Of these Arabic fragments, moreover, one has a clear Hijra dating of 327 A.H. (938 C.E.; see Figure 16.2).[115] To the best of my knowledge, this is the *only* fragment in the entire horde with a clear, explicit date of any kind.

The dated Arabic fragment reads (translation):

> In the Name of Allāh Most Gracious Most Merciful. I have collected from the inheritors of Abū Ghassān the taxes which were due on the Ṣanūn property, totaling one-third and one-eighth of one dinar for the year seven and twenty and three hundred. Written by Ibrāhīm bin Ḥammāz in the month of Rabīʿ al-Awwāl of this same year. I have placed my faith in Allāh.[116]

---

[111] E. Ulrich, F.M. Cross, J.R. Davila, N. Jastram, J.E. Sanderson, E. Tov and J. Strugnell, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, Vol. XII, Qumran Cave 4 - VII: Genesis to Numbers,* Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1994.

[112] H. Shanks, "Books in Brief", *Biblical Archaeology Review,* Sep./Oct. 1995, vol. 21, no. 5, pp. 6, 8.

[113] *ibid,* p. 8.

[114] For a detailed analysis of this subject, including dozens of test cases, look for my forthcoming book *Islamic Studies: What Methodology?*

[115] R.H. Eisenman and J.M. Robinson, *A Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls,* Bilical Archaeology Society, Washington, DC, 1991, Vol. 1, Plate No. 294. For more samples refer to plates Nos. 643-648.

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
قد قبضت من ورثة ابو غسان عن كفر
صنون ثلث وثمن دينر لسنة سبع وعشرين
وثلثمائة وكتب ابراهيم بن حماز في شهر ربيع
الاول من هذه السنة توكلت على الله

Figure 16.2: An Arabic fragment from a cave in Wadī Murraba'āt with a clear Hijra dating of 327 A.H./938 C.E. along with a line for line transcription. Image source: Eisenman and Robinson, A Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls, *vol. 1, plate 294.*

A total of seven Arabic fragments have been reproduced in the *Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls*; the one above is the most legible and complete. At least five other Arabic fragments, one of them of considerable length, were found in the Wadī Murrabaʿāt cave but were not seen fit by the authors for inclusion in their work, although they have been reproduced elsewhere.[117]

Whatever the explanation for these Arabic fragments – that the caves were never properly sealed, or were sealed but rediscovered over ten centuries ago, or that portions were sealed and others were not – the fact is that absolutely none of the OT fragments can be pigeonholed definitively into one of the two golden periods of 66-70 C.E. and 132-135 C.E.[118] This sheds new light on J.T. Milik's appraisal of the Minor Prophets Scroll, that "there are even striking similarities to the script of medieval manuscripts".[119] If within these caves lay an Arabic fragment from the 10th century C.E., what would prevent someone from depositing biblical fragments in any century up to and including the tenth as well? Excavations from the 1950s already concluded that these caves were "inhabited repeatedly from 4000 B.C. to the Arabian period".[120] So unless the implication is that Jews wholly abandoned the caves from 135 C.E. to the 20th century, even as medieval Muslims enjoyed access to them, the premise for assigning dates is utterly void. What conceivable proof is there that no Jews entered the Wadī Murabba'āt in 300, 500, or even 700 C.E.?[121]

---

[116] The English translation is based on the Arabic transcription after Maḥmūd al-ʿĀbidī, *Makhṭūṭāt al-Baḥr al-Mayyit,* ʿAmmān, Jordan, 1967, p. 343.

[117] *ibid,* pp. 342-346.

[118] The parchments taken from Qumran, which on occasion differ considerably from the Masoretic text, were written by members of the Essene community. This was a monastic order that sought to practice the strictest Judaism, believing for example that "the bowels must not perform their wonted functions" on the Sabbath. [*Dictionary of the Bible,* p. 268.] The eventual disappearance of this order means that all the material from Qumran which follows the textual variants preferred by the Essenes, must have been scribed whilst the order was still alive. On the other hand, the Wadī Murabbaʿāt texts coincide more or less with the one text type that is still current, and so could have possibly originated at any point up until the Middle Ages.

The preliminary assessment of some scholars, such as Oxford's Sir Godfrey Driver, initially dated the Dead Sea Scrolls to the 6th/7th centuries C.E., before others wrenched this back to the 1st/2nd centuries C.E.[122] And by no means is this uncommon: a fragment of Leviticus taken from Qumran, and written in Old Hebrew script, ignited a controversy among scholars concerning its date of origin. Suggestions ranged from the fifth to the first century B.C.E., with the final consensus being that it could be as recent as the first century C.E., thus giving this fragment a total breathing space of six hundred years.[123] Analysis of this sort suffers from subjectivity on a massive scale. Based on the concrete evidence above, the contention that the OT text was standardized between 70-135 C.E. is completely unsustainable.

8. God's Covenant: Examples of Deliberate Textual Corruption

Let us examine a passage in the OT which I believe illustrates a very early deliberate corruption, specifically, chapter seventeen of Genesis. Abraham's wife, Sarah, gave him her handmaid Hagar "to be his wife", and from her was born his first son Ishmael. We pick up the story thirteen years later.

Genesis 17 (*King James Version*)

1 And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the Lord appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect.

---

[119] See Würthwein, p. 164.

[120] *ibid*, p. 164.

[121] This is quite possible, since "some Jewish groups had continued to live in Palestine probably right through the Moslem domination". [*Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 720.]

[122] See M. al-'Ābidī, *Makhṭūṭāt al-Baḥr al-Mayyit*, pp. 96, 101.

[123] Würthwein, p. 160.

2 And I will make *my covenant between me and thee*, and will multiply thee exceedingly.

3 And Abram fell on his face: and God talked with him, saying,

4 As for me, behold, my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations.

5 Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham; for a father of many nations have I made thee.

6 And I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee.

7 *And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant*, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee.

8 And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God.

9 And God said unto Abraham, Thou shalt keep my covenant therefore, thou, and thy seed after thee in their generations.

10 *This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee; Every man child among you shall be circumcised.*

11 And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; *and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you.*

14 And the uncircumcised man child whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant.

15 And God said unto Abraham, As for Sarai thy wife, thou shalt not call her name Sarai, but Sarah shall her name be.

16 And I will bless her, and give thee a son also of her: yea, I will bless her, and she shall be a mother of nations; kings of people shall be of her.

17 Then Abraham fell upon his face, and laughed, and said in his heart, Shall a child be born unto him that is an hundred years old? and shall Sarah, that is ninety years old, bear?

18 And Abraham said unto God, O that Ishmael might live before thee!

19 And God said, Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son indeed; *and thou shalt call his name Isaac: and I will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant, and with his seed after him.*

20 And as for Ishmael, I have heard thee: Behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly; twelve princes shall he beget, and I will make him a great nation.

21 *But my covenant will I establish with Isaac*, which Sarah shall bear unto thee at this set time in the next year.

22 And he left off talking with him, and God went up from Abraham.

23 *And Abraham took Ishmael his son,* and all that were born in his house, and all that were bought with his money, every male among the men of Abraham's house; *and circumcised the flesh of their foreskin in the selfsame day, as God had said unto him.*
25 And Ishmael his son was thirteen years old, when he was circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin.
26 *In the selfsame day was Abraham circumcised, and Ishmael his son.*[124]

The objective reader will discern a problem with this narrative. God pledges, confirms, and reassures Abraham repeatedly about His covenant, the symbol of which is circumcision. Now the only son Abraham had at that time was Ishmael, a boy of thirteen, and father and son were both circumcised on the same day. Regardless of whether he bears this stamp or not however, Ishmael is thrown entirely out of the covenant – and for no fathomable reason. God expels a boy out of His covenant against His Own dictates.

Returning to Genesis, in 17:16-21 Abraham is given the glad tidings that Sarah shall have a child named Isaac "at this set time in the next year". But in the next chapter we read:

10 And [the Lord] said, I will certainly return unto thee according to the time of life; and, lo, Sarah thy wife shall have a son. And Sarah heard it in the tent door, which was behind him.
11 Now Abraham and Sarah were old and well stricken in age; and it ceased to be with Sarah after the manner of women.
12 Therefore Sarah laughed within herself, saying, After I am waxed old shall I have pleasure, my lord being old also?
13 And the Lord said unto Abraham, Wherefore did Sarah laugh, saying, Shall I of a surety bear a child, which am old?
14 Is any thing too hard for the Lord? At the time appointed I will return unto thee, according to the time of life, and Sarah shall have a son.

The news took Sarah by surprise, whose shock gave way to quiet laughter. But this divine promise was only a reiteration of the previous chapter: "And God said, Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son indeed; and thou shalt call his name Isaac: and I will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant, and with his seed after him". If the narrative bears out then Sarah had no cause for astonishment in the next chapter. That she really had no prior knowledge of this incident establishes a strong case for the deliberate interpolation of these verses in Genesis 17, which oust Ishmael from God's covenant regardless of whether or not he is circumcised.

---

[124] Emphasis added.

Let us turn our attention to Josephus. Earlier he describes Ishmael as the first son of Abraham, then suddenly claims Isaac as the legitimate son of Abraham and his only begotten.[125] On what basis does Isaac become the legitimate son to the exclusion of Ishmael? Does that imply Ishmael being illegitimate and, by extension, Abraham being adulterous? Josephus' intentions are not transparent, but what is clear is that he mirrors the OT's aversion of Ishmael, an aversion which rears its head in a few other verses as well. In Genesis 22:2 we find:

> And [the Lord] said, Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah; and offer him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of.

How is it possible for Isaac to become the *only* son, when Ishmael was at least thirteen years older? 'Most beloved' one could grasp, but the two obviously do not equate. And if this verse implies that Isaac is the only worthy or legitimate son because Ishmael's mother was a slave, then what about the twelve sons of Jacob, all of whom have the same status as progenitors of the twelve tribes of Israel, regardless of whether they were born of wives or concubines? To my mind this is another clear case of textual corruption within the OT, perhaps motivated in no small measure by the Israelite hatred of Ishmaelites. Nowhere is this animosity more glaring than in Psalms 83, a few verses of which are rendered here from the *Revised Standard Version*:

1 O God, do not keep silence; do not hold thy peace or be still, O God!
2 For lo, thy enemies are in tumult; those who hate thee have raised their heads.
4 They say, "Come, let us wipe them out as a nation; let the name of Israel be remembered no more!"
5 Yea, they conspire with one accord; against thee they make a covenant—
6 the tents of Edom and the *Ishmaelites*, Moab and the Hagrites,
7 Gebal and Ammon and Amalek....
13 O my God, make them like whirling dust, like chaff before the wind.
17 Let them be put to shame and dismayed for ever; let them perish in disgrace.[126]

Could Jewish scribes, bearing such abhorrence towards the Ishmaelites, have shown generosity (or even fairness) towards Ishmael himself in transmitting the OT text? Or would they have made him out as an 'unbegotten', an inferior, and in the process raised the rank of their own ancestor Isaac if the opportunity afforded itself?[127]

---

[125] Josephus, *Antiq.*, Book 1, Ch. 12, No. 3 (215), and Book 1, Ch. 13, No. 1 (222).
[126] Emphasis added.

Being cast out of the covenant was not only Ishmael's lot however, but also that of half of Isaac's family, as can be seen by the inclusion of 'Edom' in verse 6 above. Based on the OT Isaac had twin sons:[128] (a) Esau (or Edom), who was born first from the womb, and (b) Jacob, who is the recognized ancestor of the twelve tribes of Israel.

Oddly enough, Jacob managed to cheat his brother twice: first when he refused him red lentil soup though he was in danger of collapsing from hunger, until Esau had relinquished his rights as first-born;[129] second, when Jacob and his mother stole the blessing that was intended for Esau by fooling Isaac in the darkness, in a scheme involving a tuft of fake hair (as Esau's hands were hairier than his brother's).[130] Despite this treachery, Jacob's descendants were to become the sole progenitors of the tribes of Israel while Esau's children were to have no share.

> The Israelites were conscious that the Edomites were their near kinsmen and an older nation.... [The enmity between Esau and Jacob] is an actual reflection of the hostile relations of the Edomites and Israelites, for which the latter were to a considerable degree responsible.[131]

With this historical enmity at play, it is perhaps no surprise that God's final words to Moses skip over the names of Ishmael and Esau:

> Moses, this is the land I was talking about when I solemnly promised Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob that I would give land to their descendants. I have let you see it, but you will not cross the Jordan and go in.[132]

At the first stage Ishmael was expelled from the covenant on the pretext that God, amending His plan, would include all of Abraham's progeny through Isaac only. Subsequently even this did not hold true and Jacob, through his wiles, managed to oust half of Isaac's progeny, securing the covenant for himself and his twelve children – whether born of wives or concubines.[133] This casting out of Ishmael and his progeny, and Esau and his progeny, appears to be a systematic fabrication emanating from sources that were strongly partial to only Jacob and his descendants.

---

[127] Once again I quote Würthwein's *The Text of The Old Testament*: "There is clear evidence that no qualms were felt in altering the text when there appeared to be adequate doctrinal reasons". [p. 17.]

[128] Genesis 25:23-26.

[129] Genesis 25:29-34.

[130] Genesis 27

[131] *Dictionary of the Bible*, p.229.

[132] *CEV*, Deuteronomy 34:4.

[133] Eight of the twelve children were born to his two wives and the other four to his two concubines. For details see p. 252 (1,Jacob's family).

If one argues that the covenant is the mercy and gift of God, then He possesses the full right to bestow it wherever He pleases and exempt whosoever He pleases. But this exclusion of Ishmael and Esau do not fit God's Own edict: "And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, *for an everlasting possession*".[134] The historical reality is that 'all the land of Canaan' was not ruled by the Israelites for more than 250 years, beginning from the time of David (*c.* 1000-962 B.C.E.) and ending with the surrender of Samaria and the fall of the northern kingdom of Israel (721 B.C.E.). God's promise of an everlasting ownership is contradicted by history. One has to discard either God's proclamation or the interpolated verses which banish Ishmael and his progeny. And if we choose to discard the latter then God's promise is fulfilled, since Canaan has always been in the custody of the children of Abraham.

Genesis 13 states:

> 14 And the Lord said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward:
> 15 For all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever.
> 16 *And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth*: so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered.[135]

This passage, and a similar one that occurs two chapters later, place additional weight against the interpolated verses of Genesis 17. Throughout history there have been far fewer Jews than Arabs, descendants of Ishmael, so that the appellation 'dust of the earth' cannot be used to depict only the former. History compels us to view the expulsion of Ishmael from God's covenant as a deliberate distortion fuelled by prejudice.

9. Conclusion

In the numerous centuries that lapsed between Moses' ascent to Mount Sinai and the eventual standardization of a Hebrew text, by nothing short of a miracle could the text have been preserved free of changes or interpolations.

---

[134] Genesis 17:8. Italics added.

[135] Genesis 13:14-16; emphasis added. See also Genesis 15:3-5.

Every facet of Jewish history proclaims that no such miracle occurred. We note that the political situation in Palestine, even during a unified Jewish state, was not at all favorable for the proper and sanctified propagation of the OT; rarely did a king bestow any devotion on it, with the majority erecting idols instead and indulging in all manner of pagan rituals. On top of all this the text itself disappeared repeatedly, and for centuries at a time.

The foundations of Jewish literary and religious culture were themselves derivative of other societies, causing further infiltration into the OT from the very outset of Israelite history. For example: (a) the Hebrew language was borrowed from the Phoenicians; (b) the script was appropriated from the Aramaic and the Assyrians; (c) the diacritical system of the Hebrew Torah was taken from the Arabic; (d) the Book of the Covenant (roughly Exodus 20:22-23:19) was possibly adapted from the Code of Hammurabi, *etc.*

The text itself remained fluid till the 10th century C.E., nearly 2300 years after Moses' death: fluid in that it remained open to alterations given sufficient doctrinal needs. And once the change was complete, the original became 'defective' and was destroyed, eliminating all traces of a trail which might otherwise have led back to something older and more intact.

Turning our attention towards the Qur'ān, we read the verse:

﴿ ٱلَّذِينَ يَتَّبِعُونَ ٱلرَّسُولَ ٱلنَّبِىَّ ٱلْأُمِّىَّ ٱلَّذِى يَجِدُونَهُۥ مَكْتُوبًا عِندَهُمْ فِى
ٱلتَّوْرَىٰةِ وَٱلْإِنجِيلِ ﴾[136]

> Those who follow the Messenger, the unlettered Prophet, whom they find mentioned in their own [Scriptures], in the Torah and Gospel...

This affirms that even the corrupted texts of the Old and New Testaments contained clear references to the forthcoming prophet. Such references were noted by many of the Prophet's Companions and successors,[137] but have since been largely cleansed.[138]

I will close this chapter with two interesting quotes:

> The central myth of classical Judaism is the belief that the ancient Scriptures constituted divine revelation, but only a part of it. At Sinai God had handed down a dual revelation: the written part known to one and all, but also the oral part preserved by the great scriptural heroes, passed on by prophets to various ancestors in the obscure

---

[136] Qur'ān 7:157.

[137] For details see Ibn Kathīr, *Tafsīr*, iii:229-234.

[138] Though there are still a few traces left. See Yusuf Ali, *Translation of Holy Qur'an*, footnote of 48:29.

> past, and finally and most openly handed down to the rabbis who created the Palestinian and Babylonian Talmuds.[139]

> With [the Qumran] material at their disposal, experts concerned with the study of the text... are in a position to prove that it has remained virtually unchanged for the last two thousand years.[140]

In light of the OT's history, as we have seen, the above statements are nothing more than the most wishful of thoughts.

There is much that we can contrast in these paragraphs and pages with the Muslim reverence for the Qur'ān, though the alert reader will undoubtedly have done so already, and there will be yet more food for thought when we turn our gaze next to the NT.

---

[139] J. Neusner, *The Way of Torah*, p. 81.

[140] Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, Pelican Books, 2nd edition, 1965, p. 12.

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

EARLY HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY: A BRIEF LOOK

> The Trinitarian believes a virgin to be the mother of a son who is her maker.[1]

Proving the existence of a historical Jesus is almost impossible; there are Christian theologians who are now content with a Jesus based on faith rather than an actual historical figure.[2] So let us open this chapter with the question, did Jesus exist? And if so, what evidence do we have from non-Christian sources (the same 'revisionist' criterion that is invoked by Judeo-Christian scholars against Islam)? What is the spectrum of Christian views regarding Jesus? This will shed considerable light on how little is known about him and on the confusion that reigned in early Christian circles. Also, what was his original message? Was it irretrievably lost in its early stages or was it preserved intact in an inspired book? These are some of the questions and topics I hope to cover in this chapter.

1. Did Jesus Exist?

The first fundamental issue we must pose is whether Jesus truly was a real-life figure. Muslims unequivocally believe in his existence, of his birth from the Virgin Mary and his role as one of the most sublime prophets to the Jewish people. Some Christian scholars though are much more hesitant of Jesus' historicity.

> During the past thirty years theologians have come increasingly to admit that it is no longer possible to write a biography of [Jesus], since documents earlier than the gospels tell us next to nothing of his life, while the gospels present the 'Kerygma' or proclamation of faith, not the Jesus of history.[3]

---

[1] B. Montagu (ed.), *The Works of Francis Bacon*, William Pickering, London, 1831, vii:410.

[2] Bultmann as quoted by G.A. Wells, *Did Jesus Exist?*, 2nd edition, Pemberton, London, 1986, p. 9.

[3] G.A. Wells, *Did Jesus Exist?* p. 1.

i. References to Jesus in Non-Christian Books from the First Century

The writings of the Jewish historian Josephus (37 – *c.* 100 C.E.), which cover the period up to 73 C.E., do contain two passages about Jesus the Christ. Of these the longer is quite obviously a Christian interpolation, for it is "a glowing description which no orthodox Jew could have written".[4] The second passage has been scrutinized by Schuror, Zahn, von Dobschutz, Juster and other scholars, and they regard the words "the brother of Jesus, him called Christ" as a further interpolation.[5] The lone pagan reference still commonly cited is Tacitus' statement,

> that Christians 'derive their name and origin from Christ, who, in the reign of Tiberius, had suffered death by the sentence of the procurator Pontius Pilate.' Tacitus wrote this about A.D. 120, and by then Christians had themselves come to believe that Jesus had died in this way. I tried to show… that there are good reasons for supposing that Tacitus was simply repeating what was then the Christian view, and that he is therefore not an independent witness.[6]

ii. The Historical Christ in Christian Circles

So we see that using primary sources to establish Jesus as a historical figure is impossible.

Assuming that he did walk the earth, and was a central figure in the God-head, it seems only natural that the Christian community must have chronicled all information regarding him. Like a modern day athlete or international movie star, all tidbits relating to him must have been collected, preserved, perused and treasured. The reality was quite to the contrary.

A. THE LIFE OF JESUS: SECONDARY SOURCES

Christ's influence on Western civilization is incalculable, yet collecting materials about his life and teachings is wrought with difficulties. Source material is limited to the New Testament (NT), and more specifically to the four gospels. Because they were primarily written to convert unbelievers and strengthen the resolve of the faithful, these gospels fail to provide much of the crucial historical information sought by biographers. The works therefore open themselves up to interpretation, and interpreters often commit the mistake of seeing the texts through the filter of their own beliefs regarding Jesus, finding in the texts exactly what they set out to discover in the first place.[7]

---

[4] *ibid*, p. 10.

[5] *ibid*, p. 11.

[6] *ibid*, p. 13.

[7] *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 477.

These canonical sources, four gospels and other NT writings, are so meager that they do not allow the drafting of a full biography. The life of Jesus was in fact relevant only insofar as it furthered Christian dogma; with only a handful of gospel passages ever emphasized in congregations (as noted by Maurice Bucaille),[8] interest in the historical Jesus was at best merely subsidiary.

Hermann Reimarus, Professor of Oriental Languages in Hamburg during the 1700s, was the first to attempt a historical reconstruction of Jesus' life.[9] Before Reimarus, "the only life of Jesus… which has any interest for us was composed by a Jesuit in the Persian language".[10] Written in the latter half of the 1500s it was tailored specifically for the use of Akbar, the Moghul emperor. This biography is,

> a skilful falsification of the life of Jesus in which the omissions, and the additions taken from the Apocrypha, are inspired by the sole purpose of presenting to the open-minded ruler a glorious Jesus, in whom there should be nothing to offend him.[11]

The dubious nature of this work did not stop it from being translated into Latin a century later, by a theologian of the Reformed Church who wanted to discredit Catholicism.[12] And so the first attempt at a biography, written a full sixteen centuries after Jesus walked the winding alleys of Jerusalem, was nothing more than a historically erroneous missionary text which became another pawn in the doctrinal wars between Catholics and Protestants. Even subsequent scholars failed to compose a workable biography. After the loss of the original gospel,[13] no successful effort appears to have been made during the two thousand years of Christianity to compile a historical overview of Jesus. Robert Funk describes the case as follows:

> So far as I have been able to discover, no one had ever compiled [a] list of all the words attributed to Jesus in the first three hundred years following his death…. Among the many scholarly books written on Jesus in the last century and more… I could find no critical list of sayings and deeds…. [Among my colleagues] no one had compiled a raw list… [even though] most of them lecture or write about Jesus nearly every day.[14]

---

[8] Maurice Bucaille, *The Bible, The Qur'an and Science*, American Trust Publications, Indianapolis, Indiana, 1978.

[9] Albert Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, Collier Books, 1968, p. 13. Cited thereafter as Schweitzer.

[10] *ibid*, p. 13.

[11] *ibid*, p. 14.

[12] *ibid*, p. 14.

[13] *i.e.* the disciples' own writings concerning the teachings of Jesus. See pp. 313 - 14.

[14] R.W. Funk, B.B. Scott and J.R. Butts, *The Parables of Jesus: Red Letter Edition*, Polebridge Press, Sonoma, California, 1988, p. xi.

So scant is the historical material that even the sketching of an outline is problematic, unless one chooses to forsake historicity and rely instead on the 'Jesus of faith' as portrayed in the NT.[15]

iii. Christ and His Mother-Tongue

This lack of information is so broad that we are kept in ignorance of many of Jesus' most fundamental attributes. If a full list of his sayings has never been known, have scholars at least agreed on what tongue these sayings were uttered in? The gospels, as well as Christian writers from past and present, have failed to provide any answer with certainty. Among the guesswork of early scholars in this regard we have: a Galilaean dialect of Chaldaic (J.J. Scaliger); Syriac (Claude Saumaise); the dialect of Onkelos and Jonathan (Brian Walton); Greek (Vossius); Hebrew (Delitzsch and Resch); Aramaic (Meyer); and even Latin (Inchofer, for "the Lord cannot have used any other language upon earth, since this is the language of the saints in heaven").[16]

iv. Christ: the Moral Attributes of God?

In the God-head Christ is said to be one in three. Anyone entering a church however, any traditionally recognized church, will immediately discern the total absence of two-thirds of this God-head. The Father and the Holy Spirit are nowhere to be seen while the ubiquitous visage of Jesus Christ stares down from church walls and lets in rainbow colors through stained glass windows. Yet despite his elevated role his treatment at the hands of some Christian writers leaves his legacy riddled with black spots, so much so that it becomes difficult to accept him as a figure universally beloved by Christians – or at the least, as a person whose morality they deem worthy of emulating.

A. CANON MONTEFIORE: WAS JESUS GAY?

Speaking of Jesus at the Modern Churchmen's conference at Oxford, 1967, Canon Hugh Montefiore, Vicar of Great St. Mary, Cambridge, stated:

> Women were his friends, but it is men he is said to have loved. The striking fact was that he remained unmarried, and men who did not marry usually had one of three reasons: they could not afford it, there were no girls, or they were homosexual in nature.[17]

---

[15] Bultmann, as referred to by G.A. Wells, *Did Jesus Exist?* p. 9.

[16] Schweitzer, op. cit., pp. 271, 275.

[17] *The Times*, July 28, 1967.

B. MARTIN LUTHER: JESUS COMMITTED ADULTERY THRICE

Martin Luther also negates the image of a sinless Jesus. This is to be found in Luther's *Table-Talk*,[18] whose authenticity has never been challenged even though the coarser passages are cause for embarrassment. Arnold Lunn writes:

> Weimer quoted a passage from the *Table-Talk* in which Luther states that Christ committed adultery three times, first with the woman at the well, secondly with Mary Magdalene, and thirdly with the woman taken in adultery, "whom he let off so lightly. Thus even Christ who was so holy had to commit adultery before he died".[19]

2. Jesus' Disciples

Casting aside these accusations let us look into the NT itself. Being works of faith the gospels portray Jesus' inner resilience in the most shining light possible, as they must. But what of his disciples, those who bore the burden of circulating his message and the nucleus through which Christianity blossomed. How are they depicted? In the gospels the twelve disciples do receive special teaching and training, as Jesus was likely preparing leaders to carry on in his stead. But interspersed we find several episodes of poor discipleship. In Mark the twelve hardly understand anything they are taught,[20] and an exasperated Jesus proclaims, "O faithless generation, how long am I to be with you? How long am I to bear with you?"[21] On the night of his arrest they continually fail to stay awake in prayer, even as he chides them.[22] At his arrest they flee. Peter, following at a distance and witnessing his master condemned and spat on, thrice denies to the crowd having any connection to him.[23]

If we take the gospels as an honest depiction of Jesus' life and the events surrounding his death, then what we read regarding the twelve serves to undercut the reader's faith in the text, this being a portrait of Christianity's first line of teachers. I must note that there is much external evidence to challenge the gospel accounts;[24] this has immediate bearing on whether the portrayal of the disciples is accurate or otherwise. Whichever view one subscribes to, that they were indeed incompetent (suggesting that Jesus' teachings were compromised in the earliest stages), or that they were competent but depicted dishonestly by succeeding writers, the end result is to cast doubt on the gospels' accuracy and hence, their collective creed.

---

[18] Weimar edition, ii:107.

[19] Arnold Lunn, *The Revolt Against Reason*, Eyre & Spottiswoode (Publishers), London, 1950, p. 233. Here is the original: "*Christus adulter. Christus ist am ersten ein ebrecher worden Joh. 4, bei dem brunn cum muliere, quia illi dicebant: Nemo significat, quid facit cum ea? Item cum Magdalena, item cum adultera Joan. 8, die er so leicht dauon lies. Also mus der from Christus auch am ersten ein ebrecher werden ehe er starb*".

[20] B.M. Metzger and M.D. Coogan, *ed., The Oxford Companion to the Bible*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1993, p. 783.

[21] Mark 9:19.

[22] Matthew 26:36-45.

[23] Matthew 26:69-75.

3. Jesus and his Message: Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at Hand

All sources for the teachings of Jesus emanate from anonymous authors. As noted earlier, Hermann Reimarus (1694-1768) was the first to attempt a historical modeling of Jesus. In this he drew a distinction between what lies written in the gospels and what Jesus himself proclaimed during his lifetime, concluding that his actual teachings can be summed up,

> in two phrases of identical meaning, '*Repent, and believe the Gospel,*' or, as it is put elsewhere, '*Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.*'[25]

Because he never went on to explain either of these phrases, Reimarus argues that Jesus was working and preaching within a wholly Jewish framework, content with having his audience understand 'the Kingdom of Heaven' in the Jewish context. Namely, that he was the Deliverer of Israel. The intention of setting up a new religion never existed.[26]

i. Jesus and the Scope of his Message

By aiming his teachings at a Jewish audience and expressing concepts from within a strictly Judaic framework, Jesus was clearly limiting his message to that sector of society. This is clear from Jesus' statement as recorded in Matthew 10:5-6:

> 5 These twelve [disciples] Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into *any* city of the Samaritans enter ye not:
> 6 But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.

---

[24] See Chapter 18.
[25] Schweitzer, p. 16. Italics added.
[26] *ibid*, pp. 16-18.

It is also plainly stated in the Qur'ān:

> ﴿ وَيُعَلِّمُهُ ٱلْكِتَٰبَ وَٱلْحِكْمَةَ وَٱلتَّوْرَىٰةَ وَٱلْإِنجِيلَ ﴿٤٨﴾ وَرَسُولًا إِلَىٰ بَنِىٓ إِسْرَٰٓءِيلَ ﴾[27]
>
> And [Allāh] will teach [Jesus] the Book and Wisdom, the Law and the Gospel, and [appoint him] a messenger to the Children of Israel ...

Some modern Christian scholars also acknowledge this. As Helmut Koester notes:

> It is a simple historical fact that Jesus was an Israelite from Galilee, and that he understood himself to be nothing else but a prophet in Israel and for Israel – a venerable tradition, and he was not the first of these prophets of Israel who was rejected and persecuted.[28]

Koester is not alone. "Jesus certainly thought of himself as a prophet (Mark 6.4; Luke 13.33) but there was a final quality about his message and work that entitles us to conclude that he thought of himself as God's final, definitive emissary to Israel."[29] Luther, Voltaire, Rousseau and Bultmann are all of the same opinion.

ii. Christian Creeds

As Jesus never avowed a message beyond that he was the Deliverer, the Messiah, so neither did he define a specific creed, and within a few decades this resulted in chaos. The early Eastern Creeds include "I. *Epistola Apostolorum.* II. The Old Creed of Alexandria. III. The Shorter Creed of the *Egyptian Church Order.* IV. The Marcosian Creed. V. The Early Creed of Africa. VI. The Profession of the 'Presbyters' at Smyrna".[30] The earliest of these is worth quoting for its shortness and simplicity:

> *Epistola Apostolorum*
> (Faith)
> In God the Father Almighty;
> In Jesus Christ, our Saviour;
> And in the Spirit, the Holy, the Paraclete;
> Holy Church;
> Forgiveness of sins.[31]

---

[27] Qur'ān 3:48-9.
[28] Helmet Koester, "Historic Mistakes Haunt the Relationship of Christianity and Judaism", *Biblical Archaeology Review*, vol. 21, no. 2, Mar/Apr 1995, p. 26. Koester, a Lutheran pastor, is John H. Morrison Professor of New Testament Studies and Winn Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Harvard Divinity School.
[29] *The Oxford Companion to the Bible*, p. 360.
[30] F.J. Badcock, *The History of the Creeds*, Second edition, London 1938. p. 24.
[31] *ibid*, p. 24.

Compare this to the highly verbose Nicene Creed from the fourth century:

> *I* believe in one God
> *the* Father Almighty,
> Maker of heaven and earth,
> And of all things visible and invisible:
> And in one Lord Jesus Christ,
> the only-begotten Son of God,
> Begotten of his Father
> before all worlds,
> *God of God,*
> Light of Light,
> Very God of very God,
> Begotten, not made,
> Being of one substance with the Father,
> By whom all things were made:
> Who for us men,
> and for our salvation
> came down from heaven (Gk. *the heavens*),
> And was incarnate
> *by* (Gk. *of*) the Holy Ghost
> *of* (Gk. *and*) the Virgin Mary,
> And was made man,
> And was crucified *also* for us
> under Pontius Pilate.
> *He* (no *and*) suffered
> and was buried,
> And the third day he rose again
> according to the Scriptures,
> And ascended into heaven (Gk. *the heavens*)
> And sitteth
> on the right hand of the Father.
> And he shall come (Gk. *cometh*) again with glory
> to judge *both the* quick and *the* dead:
> Whose kingdom shall have (Gk. *of whose kingdom there shall be*)
> no end.
> And *I believe* in the Holy Ghost,
> the Lord and (Gk. *the*) giver of life,
> Who proceedeth from the Father *and the Son,*
> Who with *the* Father and *the* Son
> together is worshipped and glorified,
> Who spake by the Prophets.
> *And I believe* one
> Catholick and Apostolick Church.
> *I* acknowledge one Baptism
> for *the* remission of sins.

> *And I* look for *the* Resurrection of *the* dead,
> And *the* life of the world to come.
> Amen.[32]

These two vastly divergent creeds testify that Jesus never truly defined his message, or that it suffered distortion in myriad ways, for otherwise a simple statement of faith would not have ballooned into a prodigious sermon. The earliest creed lacks any Trinitarian reference, whereas the Nicene incorporates Son of God, God of God, and Begotten, all of which attests to the ever-changing nature of belief regarding Jesus during Christianity's formative days.

iii. The Implications of the Term 'Christian' in the Early Days

In fact it appears that the term 'Christian' was merely an invention of Roman propaganda, for in the early days,

> the name 'Christian' was associated with all kinds of detestable crime – this, too, is a common feature of the political propaganda, and the author of 1 Peter... admonishes his readers not to suffer for the things which for the populace were implied in the name 'Christian,' (4:15) *e.g.* as "a murderer, thief, wrongdoer [better malicious magician], or mischief-maker."[33]

The early church busied itself with fighting this 'Christian' appellation, which in Roman minds was equated with a breed of criminals. The origins of this terminology imply that it was the Romans, and not the earliest Christians, who were eager to distinguish followers of the new religion from ancient Israelite tradition.[34]

4. The Persecution of Early Christians

Whilst Judaism was seen as an annoyance, its sporadic efforts at political independence invariably crushed, it was nevertheless tolerated by the Romans so long as there was no call for a revolt. Christians suffered a different fate, for while proclaiming their loyalty to the emperor they "would not participate in the worship in the temples of the gods and *were accused of being atheists*".[35] Imperial and public persecution was never more than one step away. The intellectual classes even derided Christianity as a superstition. They were viewed as a threat to the Greco-Roman way of life, given their separation from the rest of society, and because they mainly worshipped in secret, "the report was current that in their conventicles Christians engaged in sexual promiscuity".[36] Still, Christianity had taken root in most of the provinces of the Roman Empire by the middle of the 3rd century, despite recurrent local persecution and the widespread antagonism of the populace.

---

[32] *ibid*, pp. 220-1. Badcock has italicized insertions into the Greek text necessitated by translation.

[33] *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 138.

[34] In fact, the early church was content to designate the new religion simply as the Way, as in the 'Way of the Lord', the 'Way of Truth', the 'Way of Salvation', and the 'Way of Righteousness'. [See *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 139.]

Local persecution eventually matured into Imperial policy. As the Roman Empire was tangibly in decline by the latter half of the 3rd century, an Imperial edict in 249 sought to counteract this by commanding all Roman subjects to sacrifice to the gods. Stringent policies were adopted against the Christians, who refused to abide by this edict, to the point where all attendees of church services were threatened with death. In 260 the capture of Emperor Valerian by the Persians brought to an end this round of cruelty and for the next four decades the Church flourished. But in 303 the tide turned again, with a level of persecution far harsher than any the Christians had known before. Hundreds, if not thousands, perished. Toleration was finally secured through the efforts of Constantine, an aspirant to the throne, who legalized Christianity in 313 and whose own conversion, a few years thereafter, signaled Rome's sponsorship of the new religion.[37]

5. Belief Systems in Early Christianity

Confusion regarding the exact teachings of Jesus, coupled with the continuous persecution of Christians until the early 4th century, resulted in a multitudinous array of practices set up under the umbrella of Christianity. Quoting Ehrman:

> [T]here were, of course, Christians who believed in only one God; others, however, claimed that there were two Gods; yet others subscribed to 30, or 365, or more.... Some Christians believed that Christ was somehow both a man and God; others said that he was a man, but not God; others claimed that he was God, but not a man; others insisted that he was a man who had been temporarily inhabited by God. Some Christians believed that Christ's death had brought about the salvation of the world; others claimed that this death had no bearing on salvation; yet others alleged that he had never even died.[38]

Q, the original collection of Jesus' teachings, was drowned by other competing influences while the new religion was still in its infancy.[39] The texts that subsequently emerged in Christian circles, seeking to fill this void, began to acquire the status of Scripture. As conflicting strands of theology sought the basis for their beliefs in these Scriptures, various sects - holding vastly different views on Christ - played their parts in mending and molding the text, each aiming to champion its own unique theological vision.

The Orthodox Church, the sect which eventually established supremacy over all others, stood in fervent opposition to various ideas ('heresies') which were in circulation. These included Adoptionism (the notion that Jesus was not God, but a man); Docetism (the opposite view, that he was God and not man); and Separationism (that the divine and human elements of Jesus Christ were two separate beings). In each case this sect, the one that would rise to become the Orthodox Church, deliberately corrupted the Scriptures so as to bolster its own theological vision of Christ, while demolishing that of all rival sects.[40]

6. Conclusions

Consider these points: that the disciples of Jesus, according to the Bible, were students of an uncertain quality; that Q, the original gospel of Jesus, was out-competed by other ideas during the earliest stages of Christianity; that a one-time simple declaration of faith was inflated to encompass new theological notions centuries later, prompted by the lack of a distinct creed; that the great diversity of views concerning the nature of God-head resulted in the corruption of available texts for theological aims; and that on top of this internal chaos, the first three centuries of Christian history were imbued with persecution. Such a volatile atmosphere was not conducive to the preservation of Christian Scripture.

---

[35] K.S. Latourette, *Christianity through the Ages*. Harper & Row, Publishers, New York, 1965, p. 32; italics added.

[36] *ibid*, p. 33.

[37] *ibid*, pp. 32-36.

[38] Bart D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1993, p. 3. Cited thereafter as *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*.

[39] Burton L. Mack, *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q & Christian Origins*, Harper San Francisco, 1993, p. 1. The label Q is derived from the German *Quelle*, for source. Additional details will be covered in Chapter 18.

[40] *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, p. xii.

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

THE NEW TESTAMENT: ITS ANONYMOUS AUTHORSHIP AND CORRUPTION

Having dealt in the previous chapter with early Christian history, we now arrive at the NT itself and ponder a few questions: who authored the four gospels? Did they believe their works to be inspired, or was this idea developed by later generations? In what ways was the text corrupted? And perhaps first of all, how did the nature of these gospels differ from Jesus' original teachings?[1]

1. The Lost Gospel Q - A Challenge

Before the advent of the four gospels we know today, the earliest followers of Jesus composed their own book. In this there were no dramatics about the life of Christ, no narratives of spiritual sacrifice and redemption. The focus was strictly on his teachings, on the ideas, etiquette and behavior he expounded and the social reforms he called for.[2] This work is now designated as the Gospel of Jesus, Q. But Q was not a stable text, just as the earliest Christians did not live in stable times, and so over the course of the first century people living under desperate circumstances appended different layers of text to Q. The original layer is most striking: it is full of simple, eager words and wise counsel, with no calls for a new religion and no hint of Jesus Christ as something more than prophet.[3]

The second layer brings a shift in tone, portentously promising doom to those who reject the movement.[4] But to my mind the most startling shift takes place in the third and final layer of Q, added by Christians during the trying period of the First Jewish revolt (66-70 C.E.), under the shadow of the Second Temple's destruction by Roman troops.[5] Here Jesus is upgraded from a wise prophet to the Son of God, heir to the Father's Kingdom, who successfully battles the temptations in the wilderness.[6]

---

[1] The lengthy quotes I utilize in this chapter, similar to Chapters 16 and 17, are (pehaps with one exception) strictly from Judeo-Christian scholars, so that once again they may reveal their own religion to the reader.

[2] Burton L. Mack, *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q & Christian Origins*, p. 1.

[3] *ibid*, pp. 73-80.

[4] *ibid*, p. 131.

[5] *ibid*, p. 172.

And so this book too proved susceptible to corruption, a victim of the myriad mythologies circulating in Christian circles about who Jesus truly was. Yet even in this third layer there is no call for the worship of Christ, no call to honor him as a deity or retain his memory through rituals and prayer. There is no crucifixion for the cause of the movement, let alone for the atonement of all mankind.[7] Mark, Matthew, and Luke utilized Q when writing their gospels towards the end of the first century, but they willfully twisted the text (each in his own way) to achieve their desired aims.[8] In any case, Q as an actual book was soon lost.[9] The texts which displaced it, dramatic narratives of Christ's life, led to a shift in focus and helped fuel the mythologies and speculations which have clouded about the figure of Jesus ever since.

2. The Authorship of the Present Four Gospels

These Jesus mythologies remained in circulation both during and after the loss of Q, and of the many works they inspired only four rose to prominence: Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. Their authors are all unknown. In the words of Sir E. Hoskyns and N. Davey:

> If it has been found difficult, in spite of a certain amount of evidence, to give names to the authors of the synoptic gospels, it is much more difficult to assign their writing to definite dates. Here there is no clear evidence at all; and accurate dating is simply impossible. The *terminus ad quem* must be somewhere about A.D. 100.[10]

Being the products of the primitive church, the gospels represent the oral tradition of the milieu in which they were conceived, and so will remain enigmatic in terms of authorship and date. Hoskyns and Davey argue that this uncertainty does not detract from the value of these documents, when they are treated in a scholarly fashion.[11] But what guarantee of accuracy is there concerning such anonymous works? If the uncertainty of authorship does not devalue the gospel accounts, what about uncertainty of accuracy? This is a matter of tremendous doctrinal import. Bucaille quotes the reservations of Father Kannengiesser, Professor at the Catholic Institute of Paris, who,

> Warns that 'one should not take literally' facts reported about Jesus by the Gospels, because they are 'writings suited to an occasion' or 'to combat,' whose authors 'are writing down the traditions of their own community about Jesus.' Concerning the Resurrection… he stresses that none of the authors of the Gospels can claim to have been an eye-witness. He intimates that, as far as the rest of Jesus's public life is concerned, the same must be true because, according to the Gospels, none of the Apostles - apart from Judas Iscariot - left Jesus from the moment he first followed Him until His last earthly manifestations.[12]

These books of uncertain origin and questionable accuracy were later accorded greater authority by the early church through the claim that they were sacred works inspired by God, in an effort to corroborate Christian oral traditions.

3. Are the Gospels Inspired?

Inspiration, the idea that God manifestly imparts visions or abilities or revelations directly to a person, is a central concept of all monotheistic religions. But the NT never claims itself to be the work of inspiration. The sole passage to which appeal is made is 2 Timothy 3:16, that, "Every Scripture is inspired and useful for instruction". The reference here is to the OT, however, since the NT was not yet compiled in the way we know today. Elaborating on this idea, the 2nd century writer Justin Martyr further clarifies that this inspiration is attributed not to the actual Hebrew text, but only to the *accuracy* of its translation into Greek.[13]

Christian scholars often pepper their writings with the terminology of 'inspiration'; for example P.W. Comfort states that, "certain individuals… were inspired by God to write Gospel accounts to substantiate the oral tradition".[14] And again, scribes copying the NT at a later stage "may have considered themselves to have been inspired by the Spirit in making certain adjustments to the exemplar".[15] But the anonymous authors of the four gospels might well have argued their cases differently. The earliest gospel, Mark, was scavenged as source material by the later authors of Matthew and Luke, who altered, omitted, and abbreviated many of Mark's stories. Such treatment would never have transpired had they thought that Mark was inspired by God, or that his words were the unqualified truth.[16]

---

[6] *ibid*, pp. 82, 89, 173-4.

[7] *ibid*, pp. 4-5.

[8] *ibid*, p. 177.

[9] *ibid*, pp. 1-2. It is only due to text-critical analysis over the last century that the body of Q has been recognized and slowly reconstructed.

[10] Sir E. Hoskyns and N. Davey, *The Riddle of the New Testament*, Faber & Faber, London, 1963, p. 196.

[11] *ibid*, p. 201.

[12] Maurice Bucaille, *The Bible, The Qur'an and Science*, pp.47-48. This excellent book contains a wealth of information not only about science, but also Scriptural and Qur'ānic history - much of which complements the chapters in this book.

[13] See Helmut Koester, "What Is – And Is Not – Inspired", *Bible Review*, vol. xi, no 5, October 1995, p. 18.

[14] P.W. Comfort, *Early Manuscripts and Modern Translations of the New Testament*, Baker Books, 1990, p. 3. Cited thereafter as Comfort.

In this framework, inspiration easily operates as an excuse for amending the original text rather than preserving it, sanctified and untouchable. Let us now assess how the Christian community up to the present day has handled these books, and consider whether this treatment is congruent with what a sacred text deserves.

4. Transmission of the New Testament

According to Prof. Comfort, the gospels were first known in Christian circles orally before finding their way to the written page.[17] Not a single book from the NT has survived in the original author's handwriting, the closest thing being a fragment dated *c.*100-115 and containing six verses of John 18.[18]

Copies of various books from the NT were made extensively throughout the first several centuries, generally by non-professionals who rarely checked for errors afterwards. There was little incentive to check anyway: almost all Christians during the first century expected the imminent return of Christ, and likely never grasped that they were preserving a text for the distant future.[19] After some time, the texts in circulation no longer bore strict resemblance to the works that were originally authored, so that any scribe duplicating a parchment with great fidelity was not necessarily creating an

---

[15] *ibid,* p. 6.

[16] H. Koester, "What Is - And Is Not – Inspired", *Bible Review,* vol. xi, no. 5, Oct. 1995, pp. 18, 48.

[17] Comfort, p. 3.

[18] *ibid,* pp. 3-4. Here I must interject that this date is pure guesswork, a subjective enterprise that occasionally runs with a marginal difference of decades to centuries. Among the earliest Greek manuscripts of the NT to actually bear a date is one written in the Year of the World 6457 (*i.e.* 949 C.E.). [Vatican Library No. 345. See Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament, Its Transmission, Corruption, And Restoration,* 3rd edition, Oxford Univ Press, 1992, p. 56. Cited thereafter as Metzger.] The manuscript does not contain any *Christian* date, because the Anno Domini ("Year of the Lord") calendar system had yet to be invented. See also pp. 275 - 76, where the Leningrad Codex mentions a slew of dates, none of them Christian. This reaffirms that, until at least the 11th century C.E. (if not beyond), no Christian calendar system existed or at least was not in use.

[19] *ibid,* p. 6.

accurate reproduction of the original.[20] Additionally, "the early Christians did not necessarily treat the NT text as a 'sacred' text",[21] one whose every letter was fixed and holy. They may have felt themselves inspired to alter the parchment that lay before them.[22]

Regardless of whether they considered themselves inspired or not, all scribal interpolations must be recognized as corruption.

i. The Creation of Different Text Types

Scholars believe that the level of divergence (or corruption) within the NT text reached its pinnacle towards the end of the second century C.E. Each of the principal centers within the early church established its own textual variants of the NT, unique to that locality. Academics have grouped these divergent texts into four major types:

1. *The Alexandrian Text*
   Alexandrian scribes generally shied away from changing the substance of the text, preferring instead grammatical and stylistic modifications. Their manuscripts are considered fairly accurate in meaning.[23]

2. *The Western Text*
   The 'Western' form, hailing from North Africa and Italy, was unchecked and popular. It suffered numerous interpolations at the hands of scribes who, forsaking accuracy, enriched the text with traditional and even non-biblical material.[24]

3. *The Caesarean Text*
   This text type was a compromise between the previous two, following the Alexandrian in substance while keeping any Western variants that did not seem too implausible.[25]

4. *The Byzantine Text*
   Working in Syria during the early 4th century, Lucian of Antioch compared various readings of the NT to produce a revised, critical form of the text. For this he relied consistently more on the Western than the Alexandrian, and resorted to harmonization and interpolation

---

[20] *ibid,* p. 7.

[21] *ibid,* p. 6.

[22] *ibid,* p. 6.

[23] *ibid,* p. 12.

[24] *ibid,* p. 13.

[25] Metzger, p. 215.

as needed. The end result soon achieved great popularity throughout the Mediterranean, becoming the favored text of the Greek Orthodox Church; it underwent further revisions for the next four centuries until it was standardized.[26]

So the most widespread of these, the Byzantine, relied heavily on what is acknowledged to be the least trustworthy of the four, the Western. It is inevitable that Lucian incorporated into his text at least some of the interpolations which form a hallmark of the Western type. In fact the overall reach of this Western text is alarming; even the originators of the Caesarean text adulterated the relative purity of the Alexandrian with popular elements from the Western, though ostensibly aware of the latter's inferiority.

ii. Dates of Recensions

Recension is the process of scrutinizing all available copies of a document, and selecting the most trustworthy among these as the basis for a critically-revised text. Naturally the later the date of the first attempted recension, the more likely that the manuscripts being collated will harbor corruptions. George D. Kilpatrick of Queen's College, Oxford "declares that by about A.D. 200 the great majority of the deliberate changes had been introduced into the [NT] textual stream, and that thereafter scribes transmitted the several forms of text with great fidelity".[27] Modern scholars agree that there is no credible evidence of any recensions even during the 3rd century.[28] As this indicates that the vast majority of theological alterations slipped into the text before any attempt at recension,[29] we can say that many of these changes have lodged themselves permanently into the NT. And as we shall see in the case of the *Comma Johanneum*, a deliberate and major theological corruption was to take place even as late as the 16th century.[30]

5. Textual Corruption

i. Variant Readings in the New Testament

Greek handwriting in antiquity consisted of two styles. The first was cursive, written rapidly and used for everyday affairs. The second, much more formal, was called uncial.[31]

---

[26] Comfort, pp. 13-14.
[27] Metzger, p. 177.
[28] Comfort, p. 9.
[29] *ibid*, p. 15.
[30] See pp. 323 - 24.
[31] Metzger, pp. 8-9.

Figure 18.1: Example of Greek uncial script. Note that the text lacks dividers between adjacent words. Source: Metzger, The Text of the New Testament, *p. 10. Reprinted with the copyright holder's kind permission.*

In time the uncial script began to deteriorate, necessitating a scriptwriting reform during the 9th century C.E. The resulting style was termed minuscule.[32] There are approximately 2800 fragmentary pieces of the NT written in miniscule, and about one-tenth as many in uncial, but if we limit ourselves to manuscripts containing the entire NT then the numbers plummet dramatically: 58 in minuscule, and only one in uncial.[33] These figures are a cause for wonder; the number of complete copies in miniscule is particularly worrying, given that these manuscripts cover the period between the 9th and 15th centuries. Innumerable generations of Christians must have lived and died without even laying eyes on a complete copy of their own Scriptures.[34]

---

[32] *ibid*, p. 9.
[33] *ibid*, pp. 262-3.
[34] Of course these texts were not written in the vernacular, so that even the fortunate layman who did come across a copy would be unable to benefit from it. But 58 complete copies in a span of six centuries, and covering the entire Christian world, raises serious questions about the percentage of priests in that era who were privy to a complete edition of the very text they were preaching.

Figure 18.2: Example of Greek minuscule script. Source: Metzger, The Text of the New Testament, *p. 11. Reprinted with the copyright holder's kind permission.*

One notable quality of the Greek uncial was its lack of a separator, between adjacent words as well as sentences, even though separation between words had been used previously in Hebrew writings and was therefore known. This flaw resulted in a divergence of meanings or interpretations for certain verses. Among the most serious examples of this is Manuscript 𝔭75 (Bodmer Papyrus XIV-XV),[35] where John 1:18 can be read as either *an only One, God,* or *God, the only begotten.* There is clearly a profound difference between the two choices; whilst the latter implies the existence of a Trinity, nothing in the former supports it (see Figure 18.3). In fact the literal translation is 'a unique God', though it is never given as such.[36]

Additional divergence came about through intentional and unintentional alterations in the text, creating variants in some particularly sensitive passages. Examples include:

- *John 1:18.* The line *an only One, God* (or its alternate reading *God, the only begotten*) has a variant, *the only begotten Son.*[37]

---

[35] This papyrus codex – preserved at the Foundation Martin Bodmer (near Geneva) – has 51 surviving leaves containing parts of Luke and John. It is in uncial script and has been dated to around 200 C.E.

[36] Comfort, p. 105.

[37] *ibid,* p. 105.

Figure 18.3: Manuscript 𝔭75 (Bodmer Papyrus XIV-XV) written in uncial script, showing John 1:16-33. Line five from the top can be translated as either "an only One, God" or "God, the only begotten". Reprinted with Bibliotheca Bodmeriana's kind permission.

- *John 1:34. The Son of God* also has the variant *the chosen One of God.*[38]
- *John 7:53-8:11.* The entire story of Jesus and the adulteress woman is, with a single exception, not present in any Greek manuscript until the ninth century. Nevertheless it is now included in all versions of the New Testament due to its fame, though generally ending in a cautionary footnote.[39]
- *John 8:16.* The phrase *the Father who sent me* has a variant, *he who sent me.*[40]
- *John 9:35.* Jesus' appellation *the Son of God* has a variant of greater documentary evidence, *the Son of man* (a surrogate term for Messiah).[41]
- *Mark 16:9-20.* The concluding twelve verses of Mark are replaced by a much shorter ending in several manuscripts, negating any reference to Jesus' reappearance to his disciples and his subsequent ascension.[42]

---

[38] *ibid,* p. 107.

[39] *ibid,* p. 115.

[40] *ibid,* p. 117.

[41] *ibid,* p.118.

[42] See p. 330.

- *Luke 3:22. You are my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased* has a variant, *You are my Son; this day I have begotten you.*[43]
- *Luke 23:34. And Jesus said, "Father, forgive them, for they do not know what they are doing".* This passage is omitted in several diverse manuscripts, the earliest of these from *c.* 200 C.E. This verse was most likely never part of Luke's original autograph, a snippet of oral tradition that was inserted subsequently. But the phrase has proven so popular that translators are unwilling to excise it, opting instead for an advisory footnote.[44]
- *Luke 24:6* and *24:12. He is not here but is risen* and all of verse 12 (where Peter discovers Jesus' burial clothes but no body) are excluded from a few older manuscripts.[45]
- *Luke 24:51* and *24:52. And [Jesus] was carried up into heaven* and *they worshipped him* are not present in certain early manuscripts.[46]

ii. Scribal Alterations

These variants are a direct consequence of scribal alterations, both conscious and otherwise. Further exploration of this subject presents us with a flavor for the range of errors which confront the modern scholar.

In explaining away unintentional changes, scholars use psychology most skillfully in retracing the mental workings of scribes who died well over ten centuries ago. Astigmatism is blamed for the manuscript in which similar Greek letters are often transposed; a momentary wandering of the eye explains the deletion or repetition of an entire passage. Confusion when copying from dictation, mental distractions that lead to a change in the sequence of words, and even sheer stupidity, are all invoked in resolving how these blunders came to be.[47]

As with the OT, however, it is the deliberate alterations which are most troubling. Comfort divides these into seven categories:

i. Material taken from oral traditions (such as the passage concerning the adulteress in John 7:53-8:11).
ii. Additions meant for liturgical use.
iii. Additions due to the spread of asceticism (such as the insertion of 'and fasting' after 'prayer' in Mark 9:29).

---

[43] Comfort, p. 89.
[44] *ibid*, p. 101.
[45] *ibid*, p. 102.
[46] *ibid*, pp. 103-4.
[47] Metzger, pp. 186-195.

iv. The tamperings of certain sects. (The Adoptionists for example, believing that Jesus became the Son of God at the moment of baptism, changed Luke 3:22 from "this is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased" to "this is my Son; this day I have begotten you".)
v. Alterations due to doctrinal prejudices, particularly as relating to the Spirit.
vi. Harmonization.
vii. Changes incorporated by scribes who feared that readers might get the 'wrong' impression about Jesus.[48]

It is hardly surprising that the textual critic Origen, speaking in the 3rd century, mourns the discrepancy between manuscripts resulting,

> either through the negligence of certain copyists, or the perverse audacity shown by some in correcting the text, or through the fault of those who, playing the part of correctors, lengthen or shorten it as they please.[49]

As discussed previously,[50] the Orthodox Church played its own part in creating deliberate alterations, with a view to countering the advance of certain sects which harbored rival notions about the nature of Jesus (such as Adoptionism, Docetism, Separationism and Patripassianism).[51] Every group was widely suspected of changing passages to make them champion its own theological stance,[52] and with every new variant created they hurled the original further and further into obscurity.

6. The Erasmus Bible and the Comma Johanneum

A Dutch scholar and theologian, Erasmus published his first Greek NT in 1516 and the second edition three years later. Among the most serious criticisms leveled at this Bible was that it lacked the Trinitarian statement at the end of 1 John, which reads that the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost are three in one (1 John 5:7). Insisting that he had yet to find these words in any of the Greek manuscripts he had examined, he nevertheless buckled to pressure and agreed to add the *Comma Johanneum* (as it is known) if a single Greek manuscript with this passage could be uncovered. Shortly afterwards such a manuscript was indeed handed to him. In all likelihood it was a fabrication however, written by a Franciscan friar in Oxford around 1520. Though Erasmus remained true to his word and inserted the passage in his third edition, he felt it necessary to append a lengthy footnote, expressing his suspicion that the manuscript was a forgery.[53]

---

[48] Comfort, p. 8. For a detailed study of intentional corruption see: B.D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture.*
[49] *ibid*, p. 8.
[50] See pp. 310 - 11.
[51] *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, p. xii.
[52] *ibid*, p. 279.

Since the time of Erasmus only three Greek manuscripts have been found to contain the *Comma Johanneum*; the earliest of these is from the 12th century, but has the passage inserted in the margin by a 17th century hand.[54] The theological significance of this Trinitarian statement is immense. Its interpolation into Greek manuscripts so late in history (during the Renaissance) is indicative of an alarming fluidity in the text. And what was the fate of these spurious verses? In the English language they found their way into the *Authorised King James Version*, printed in 1611. No critical revisions to this much-admired work were attempted until 1881, and in fact the edition in my library (Authorised Version © 1983) still contains this passage:

> 6 This is he that came by water and blood, *even* Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth.
> 7 For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.
> 8 And there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.[55]

Interestingly the *Revised Standard Version* – which is the 1946 revision of the 1901 American version of the 1881 revised edition of the 1611 *King James Version* – omits some crucial words:

> 6 This is he who came by water and blood, Jesus Christ, not with the water only but with the water and the blood.
> 7 And the Spirit is the witness, because the Spirit is the truth.
> 8 There are three witnesses, the Spirit, the water, and the blood; and these three agree.[56]

From this we deduce that English translations of the Bible waited at least three centuries, if not more, before removing a spurious passage which had been inserted as late as the 16th century.

---

[53] Metzger, pp. 101-2.

[54] *ibid*, p. 102.

[55] *KJV*, 1 John 5:6-8.

[56] *RSV*, Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1952. 1 John 5:6-8.

7. Contemporary Corruption of the Text

Thus far I have limited myself to briefly discussing the corruption of the NT in Greek manuscripts. Perhaps there are those who will argue that, beginning with the *Revised King James Version* in 1881, every mainstream edition has sought to purify the biblical text through critical examination of early manuscripts; in other words, that these successive editions are approaching closer to the original biblical text, rather than moving away from it through intentional or accidental corruptions. This is not universally the case. Every translation is the child of a specific time and place, shaped by the social or political issues then current in the translator's psyche. Regardless of textual criticism, concern over such issues can be sufficient to push the final product further from the original text rather than pulling it nearer.

In an article entitled "The Contemporary English Version: Inaccurate Translation Tries to Soften Anti-Judaic Sentiment", J. Blenkinsopp points out just such an example:

> The Contemporary English Version of the Bible (CEV), published last year by the American Bible Society... is being actively sponsored by the American Interfaith Institute... as the first Bible to contain no anti-Judaism. The claim is presumably based on the retranslating, or in some cases the paraphrasing or simply *omitting*, of certain prejudicial allusions to Jews in the New Testament.[57]

He goes on to cite examples where 'the Jews' has been changed to 'the people', 'a great crowd of the Jews' to 'a lot of people' and so on, as well as the watering down of 'Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!'[58] to 'You Pharisees and teachers of the Law of Moses are in for trouble! You're nothing but show-offs'. The translator's aim, he concludes, must be to adhere faithfully to the text, not to cajole it into saying what the translator wants it to say.[59]

Barclay Newman, chief translator of the *CEV*, responds by insisting that he and his team were faithful to the intent of the Greek text.[60]

> In most of the New Testament, 'the Jews' is best understood to mean 'the other Jews' or 'some of the Jews' or 'a few of the Jews' or 'the Jewish leaders' or 'some of the Jewish leaders' or 'a few of the Jewish leaders'. Never does it refer to the nation as a whole.... It was

---

[57] *Bible Review*, vol. xii, no. 5, Oct 1996, p. 42. Italics added.

[58] This is as it appears in the *Revised Standard Version*, Matthew 23.

[59] *Bible Review*, vol. xii, no. 5, Oct. 1996, p. 42.

[60] B.M. Newman, "CEV's Chief Translator: We Were Faithful to the Intention of the Text", *Bible Review*, vol. xii, no. 5, Oct. 1996, p. 43.

> Pontius Pilate - the Roman governor - who sentenced Jesus to death! And those men who nailed Jesus to a cross were Roman soldiers.[61]

Newman adds that Jesus' message was meant to unite Jews and Gentiles rather than provoke anti-Jewish sentiments. A faithful rendition of the NT requires a search for "ways in which false impressions may be minimized and hatred overcome".[62] In pursuing this goal however, which in itself is in stark contrast to the Talmudic stance on Jesus,[63] the *CEV* team often creates its own false impressions by swinging in the opposite direction. For example:

- The *King James Version* provides this translation of 2 Chronicles 21:11-13:
  11 Moreover [Jehoram] made high places in the mountains of Judah, and caused the inhabitants of Jerusalem to commit fornication, and compelled Judah *thereto*.
  12 And there came a writing to him from Elijah the prophet, saying, Thus saith the Lord God of David thy father, Because thou hast not walked in the ways of Jehoshaphat thy father, nor in the ways of Asa king of Judah,
  13 But hast walked in the way of the kings of Israel, and hast made Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem to go a-whoring, like to the whoredoms of the house of Ahab, and also hast slain thy brethren of thy father's house, *which were* better than thyself.

  Both the *Revised Standard Version* and the *New World Translation*[64] provide roughly the same meaning ("unfaithfulness" and "immoral intercourse" respectively). I consulted these because the *CEV* rendering struck me as being so different:
  11 Jehoram even built local shrines in the hills of Judah and let the people sin against the Lord by worshiping foreign gods.
  12 One day, Jehoram received a letter from Elijah the prophet that said: I have a message for you from the Lord God your ancestor David worshiped. He knows that you have not followed the example of Jehoshaphat your father or Asa your grandfather.

---

[61] *ibid*, p. 43.

[62] *ibid*, p. 43.

[63] Israel Shahak writes, "According to the Talmud, Jesus was executed by a proper rabbinical court for idolatry, inciting other Jews to idolatry and contempt of rabbinical authority. All classical Jewish sources which mention his execution are quite happy to take responsibility for it: in the Talmudic account the Romans are not even mentioned". [*Jewish History, Jewish Religion*, pp. 97-98.] And as to Jesus' fate, "the Talmud states that his punishment in hell is to be immersed in boiling excrement". [*ibid*, pp. 20-21.]

[64] *New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures*, Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc. 1984.

  13 Instead you have acted like those sinful kings of Israel and have encouraged the people of Judah to stop worshiping the Lord, just as Ahab and his descendants did. You even murdered your own brothers, who were better men than you.

  Omitting the references to fornication and whoredom seems to have no basis, unless it be to keep the reader's opinion of morality during the Divided Kingdoms from slipping too far into the negative.

- Here are two verses from Isaiah, taken from the *King James Version*:
  (36:11) Then said Eliakim and Shebna and Joah unto Rab-shakeh, Speak, I pray thee, unto thy servants in the Syrian language; for we understand it: and speak not to us in the Jews' language, in the ears of the people that are on the wall.
  (36:13) Then Rab-shakeh stood, and cried with a loud voice in the Jews' language, and said, Hear ye the words of the great king, the king of Assyria.

  This same phrase ('the Jew's language' or 'the language of Canaan') can also be found in Isaiah 19:18, 2 Kings 18:26, and 2 Ch 32:18; that none of these verses cites the language in question as Hebrew is telling.[65] Both the *New World Translation* and the *Revised Standard Version* follow roughly the same phraseology. The *CEV* however renders all five instances as Hebrew, with no further annotation, bolstering false assumptions in the reader's mind with ease.

These examples were stumbled upon in the course of writing earlier portions of this book, and naturally anyone given the inclination and the time will find many additional verses where the translators have fostered new false impressions. The *CEV* is only a recent test case; over forty English translations alone are in print, each bearing its own peculiarities. For example many evangelists deemed initial editions of the Revised Standard Version too liberal; the *New Testament in Modern English* employs unusual wording; the *Living Bible* mixes text with interpretation, inserting words which make the text conform to a fundamentalist viewpoint. Most Bibles adopt a distinct theological view of Christ by choosing certain readings over others: "a young woman shall conceive" for "a virgin shall conceive" (Isaiah 7:14), "the only Son" for "only begotten Son" (John 1:14,18), "Jesus Christ" for "Jesus Christ, the Son of God" (Mark 1:1), and so on. The diversity of theological implications found in these Bibles - resulting from insertions, substitutions or omissions, let alone selective use of variants - can only be branded as a corruption of the original text.

---

[65] A topic covered previously in pp. 270 - 71.

8. Early Manuscripts Negate Prevalent Christian Doctrines

Whether through ongoing corruptions or the purging of impurities which had previously infiltrated the text, the NT as it now stands is often a sharp antagonist of the very Christian doctrines it purportedly supports. To begin with, the majority of Christians are only familiar with the few select passages that are regularly read or commented on during sermons. As Maurice Bucaille notes, "With the exception of the Protestants, it was not customary for Christians to read the Gospels in their entirety.... At a Roman Catholic school I had copies of the works of Virgil and Plato, but I did not have the New Testament".[66] Now we discover that many of these choice passages, traditional favorites of evangelists and the bedrock of the average Christian's knowledge of his own religion, are in fact spurious or at best unreliable, and have either been weakened through cautionary footnotes in present-day Bibles, or altogether omitted. These passages touch the very essence of Christian doctrine.

- **The Trinity.**
  We have already discussed at length the 16th century interpolation of the *Comma Johanneum* into 1 John 5:7, the statement of Trinity concerning "the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one". So well-acknowledged is this interpolation that I am unaware of any Bible, save the original 1611 *Authorized King James Version*, which still includes this passage. The sole remaining Trinitarian passage of any clarity is Matthew 28:19, "Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you".[67] Accordingly,

  > This late post-resurrection saying, not found in any other Gospel or anywhere else in the NT, has been viewed by some scholars as an interpolation into Matthew. It has also been pointed out that the idea of 'making disciples' is continued in 'teaching them,' so that the intervening reference to baptism with its trinitarian formula was perhaps a later insertion into the saying.[68]

- **The Deity of Jesus.**
  Whether Jesus ever referred to himself as the Son of God depends almost exclusively on Luke 10:22:

  > No one knows who the Son is except the Father, or who the Father is except the Son and any one to whom the Son chooses to reveal him.

These words are repeated verbatim in Matthew 11:27, the reason being that Luke and Matthew both lifted this passage out of Q.[69] But these words emanate from the third layer of Q, the layer added by Christians around 70 C.E.[70] Neither of the two earlier layers, including the original Q as kept by the very first followers of Jesus, contains anything about the deity of Christ. Additionally, the phrase 'Son of God' is found in the OT under several different guises and meanings, none of which imply a direct Sonship since that would run counter to Jewish monotheism.[71] In Jewish thought 'the Son of God' refers to a man who bears a moral (rather than physical) connection to God,[72] and so it is possible that early Christians used this appellation for Jesus in that sense, having been brought up in the Jewish tradition. The lure of Hellenism, wherein emperors viewed themselves as direct descendants of the gods, may be to blame in switching the perception of later Christians from the idea of a moral bond to that of one directly physical.

Returning to the NT, the *King James Version's* rendering of 1 Timothy 3:16 espouses the divinity of Jesus in human form: "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh..." Modern textual analysis has cast this reading into doubt, with all current versions opting instead for "He [or Who or Which] was manifest in the flesh". Other instances of textual criticism weakening Jesus' divinity are Mark 1:1 ("the Son of God" omitted); John 6:69 ("Christ, the Son of the living God" to "the Holy One of God"); Acts 8:37 (the entire verse, including "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God", omitted);[73] and 1 Corinthians

---

[66] Maurice Bucaille, *The Bible, The Qur'an and Science*, pp. 44-45. Even though the Bible as a whole is available in 286 languages (at last count), in this era of mass publishing it has achieved the status of a best-seller that very few actually care to read. Despite its ubiquitous presence in retail outlets, hotels, on tape, and in pop culture generally, only an estimated fifteen percent of those who possess a Bible actually read it. [M. Abū Laylā, "The Qur'an: Nature, Authenticity, Authority and Influence on the Muslim Mind", *The Islamic Quarterly*, 4th Quarter 1992, vol. xxxvi, no. 4, p. 235. The author quotes Manfred Barthel, *What Does the Bible Really Say?*, England, Souvenir Press Ltd., 1982.]

[67] *RSV*, Matthew 28:19-20.

[68] *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 1015.

[69] See pp. 313 - 14.

[70] Burton L. Mack, *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q & Christian Origins*, pp. 89, 172.

[71] See for example Genesis 6:2, Job 38:7, and Exodus 4:22.

[72] *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 143.

[73] Comfort believes the verse to be an obvious interpolation [p. 128].

15:47 ("the second man is the Lord from heaven" to "the second man is from heaven").[74]

- **Atonement.**
  This refers to the expiation of humanity's original sin by Jesus, for those who believe that Christ died for their collective sins. As such it constitutes the ultimate display of love and sacrifice in Christianity, with Jesus interceding for all mankind at the moment of greatest pain:

  > Father, forgive them for they do not know what they are doing.

  Yet this climactic utterance in Luke 23:34 (surely one of the most quoted verses in the Bible) is altogether absent from numerous ancient manuscripts, the earliest of these *c.* 200 C.E. Comfort remarks that "rather, it appears that this text was not part of Luke's original writing, but was added later...from an oral tradition".[75] So pivotal is this verse to the gospel accounts however that all publishers include it, inserting an explanatory footnote afterwards.[76] Similarly we note John 6:47 (*KJV* rendering: "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life"), where textual critique has led many modern Bibles to drop "on me" so that the verse no longer distinguishes Christ as Redeemer.

- **The Ascension.**
  None of the four Gospels relates Christ's ascent to heaven after the Resurrection with any reliability. Matthew and John both conclude without reference to an ascension. Luke 24:51 ("and was carried up into heaven") is missing from various early manuscripts,[77] and is therefore often relegated to a footnote. But certainly the strangest of all in this regard is Mark, in which the whole of twelve verses of Mark 16:9-20 - including the Ascension - is nowhere to be found in numerous manuscripts, leaving contemporary Bibles in the clumsy situation of having to provide both an extended and an abbreviated ending.[78] The result is that not a single verse touching on the Ascension has survived textual scrutiny in the four gospels.[79]

---

[74] All examples are taken from the *Revised Standard Version.*

[75] Comfort, p. 101.

[76] *ibid,* p. 101.

[77] *ibid,* p. 103.

[78] In the *RSV* Mark 16:9-20 has been demoted to a footnote with a cautionary remark. The *CEV* meanwhile provides two endings under the headings "One Old Ending to Mark's Gospel" and "Another Old Ending to Mark's Gospel".

[79] The Qur'ān however *is* explicit concerning the ascension (4:158), and so Muslims believe that Jesus—though never crucified—did indeed ascend.

9. Conclusion

There are other examples besides, but the point is clear enough: some of the very foundations of Christian doctrine, supposedly derived from biblical accounts of Christ's life, have either marginal or no support in the textually revised modern editions of the four gospels. What then is the basis of this new, theologically weakened Christianity? And what are the basic doctrines and principles to which the Church can still adhere to today with tenacity?

Previously we discerned that Jewish political history was wholly unfavorable for the preservation of the OT, with most Jewish rulers encouraging polytheism on a wide scale. The text repeatedly vanished and, after its final discovery (from whatever sources) in the 5th century B.C., was continuously subjected to alterations.

Now we see that history was no more kind towards the NT. The very fount of Christianity is a figure whose existence cannot be proven through primary sources. Some of his original teachings found their way into Q, only for Q to suffer interpolations within a few decades and disappear under the weight of all sorts of Jesus mythologies. Towards the end of the first century a few biographical works appeared; the authors were anonymous, none had any first-hand knowledge of Jesus' life, and none disclosed their sources of information. Rival sects emerged, each bearing no scruples in altering the necessary verses to strengthen its unique vision of Christ. Text types developed, diverged, gave birth to new ones, became popularized. Recensions commenced, interpolations persisted, textual analysis began casting out many significant passages. And to this day each Bible can carefully choose its variants, its wording, and so arrive at a slightly different Jesus.

Those who argue that some of Jesus' teachings still live on in the gospels miss the point that these are words devoid of their intended spirit, divorced from a proper context. While edicts concerning charity and love remain, the religion itself has been subverted from Jesus' original aims (as witnessed in Q) to that of the worship of Christ as the Son of God and of salvation through the belief that he was crucified for the sins of all mankind.

We have come very far indeed from the world of *isnāds*, reading certificates, the law of witness, personal contact, the *ḥuffāẓ*, ʿUthmān's Muṣḥaf, and a holy text that has remained unequivocally pure for over fourteen centuries. The disparity is midday sunshine versus the deepest shades of night. This contrast fuels the efforts of those who are accustomed to the biblical Scriptures, who find it inconceivable that another Book received far greater care from the Almighty and successfully escaped the pitfalls of time.

III

AN APPRAISAL OF ORIENTALIST RESEARCH

Chapter Nineteen

The Orientalist and the Qur᾽ān

The controversies surrounding Arabic paleography and Ibn Masʿūd's Muṣḥaf having already been dealt with, we turn now to the broad spectrum of Orientalist attacks against the Qur᾽ān in their numerous other forms, offering a taste of some of the efforts aimed at opposing the Qur᾽ān's textual purity through the use of illegitimate sources, unsound methodology and even straightforward deceit.

1. The Urgency of Proving Distortions in the Qur᾽ān

Intent on proving the West's moral and theological superiority Bergsträsser, Jeffery, Mingana, Pretzl, Tisdall and many others dedicated their lives to finding within the Qur᾽ān all the evils of textual corruption uncovered in the Bible. As is apparent from the previous chapter, biblical passages are flooded with variations.[1] Taken together they weaken core issues of theology and raise many concerns about spurious episodes interpolated into the text through populist influences. While the urgency of proving a similar outcome for the Qur᾽ān has gained fresh momentum in the last few years because of the Middle East's shifting political landscape, efforts in this field have largely predated these concerns. Among the historical works are: (1) A. Mingana and A. Smith (eds.), Leaves from Three Ancient Qurâns, Possibly Pre-ʿOthmânic with a list of their Variants, Cambridge, 1914; (2) G. Bergsträsser, "Plan eines Apparatus Criticus zum Koran", Sitzungsberichte

---

[1] Quoting A. Robert, "Cette masse énorme dépasse ce dont on dispose pour n'importe quel texte antique; elle a fourni quelque 200,000 variantes. La plupart sont des variantes insignifiantes … Déjà Westcott et Hort, en donnant ce chiffre, constataient que les sept huitièmes du texte étaient assurés … Il y en a pourtant" [A. Robert and A. Feuillet (eds.), *Introduction à la Bible*, tome 1 (Introduction Générale, Ancien Testament), Desclée & Cie, 1959, p. 111]. Roughly, the New Testament has some 200,000 variants, most of which are insignificant (such as variations of spellings). Westcott and Hort, while giving this number, noted that seven eighths of the text was assured. Yet there are very important variants as well. Interestingly the figure of 200,000 variants was reduced to 150,000 in the English translation of the same work [Robert and Feuillet, *Interpreting the Scriptures*, translated by P.W. Skehan *et al*, Desclee Company, NY, 1969, p. 115]. See also pp. 318 - 24.

Bayer. Akad., München, 1930, Heft 7; (3) O. Pretzl, "Die Fortführung des Apparatus Criticus zum Koran", Sitzungsberichte Bayer. Akad., München, 1934, Heft 5; and (4) A. Jeffery, The Qur'an as Scripture, R.F. Moore Company, Inc., New York, 1952.

Jeffery has probably exerted the most effort on this subject.

2. Orientalist Criticism of the Qur'ān's Compilation

There are numerous gateways for an assault on the Qur'ānic text, one of which is to question its recording and compilation.[2] It is in this spirit that Orientalists enquire why, if the Qur'ān was indeed recorded during the Prophet's lifetime, did 'Umar fear the death of the *ḥuffāẓ* on the Yamāma battlefields, informing Abū Bakr that much of the Book might disappear with them.[3] Why was the recorded material not kept in the Prophet's own custody? And if it was, why did Zaid bin Thābit fail to utilize it in preparing the *Ṣuḥuf*? These accounts, reported by al-Bukhārī and accepted by the Muslim community, imply to Orientalists that the claims of early dictation and recording are false.

A lack of knowledge, intentional ignorance (تجاهل) or a disregard for Muslim educational policies are the central culprits here. Let us first assume that there was a copy of the Qur'ān in the Prophet's possession; why did he neglect to make it available for the perusal and benefit of his Companions? Because to furnish such a copy, one that was not up-to-date with the latest revelations, abrogations or shifts in verse sequences, would be a disservice to the people. A sharing of incorrect information whose pitfalls greatly outweighed the benefits. If this copy existed, however, why did Zaid b. Thābit ignore it as a resource during the reign of Abū Bakr? Earlier I pointed out that, for a document to acquire legitimacy, a pupil must act as an eyewitness and receive it from his teacher in person. Where no element of bearing witness exists, coming across a deceased scholar's book for example, the value of the text is nullified. So it was with Zaid b. Thābit. In dictating verses to his Companions the Prophet was instituting viable transmission routes based on direct teacher-pupil contact. Conversely, because he never lent any written materials to his pupils, no element of witness lay in these parchments and neither Zaid nor anyone else could use them as a primary resource for comparative purposes.[4]

---

[2] In Jeffery's words, "Western scholars do not consent that the arrangement of the text of the Qur'ān which is in our hands now is the work of the Prophet" [*Maṣāḥif*, Introduction, p. 5]. Here Jeffery is referring to the arrangement of both sūras and verses.

[3] See p. 84.

[4] Referring back to pp. 98 - 99, Sawwār b. Shabīb's *ḥadīth* claims that Zaid compared 'Uthmān's Muṣḥaf with the Prophet's personal copy of the Qur'ān, kept in 'Ā'isha's custody. Zaid might have afforded it a secondary status in the course of his endeavors.

But if the entire Qur'ān was recorded during the Prophet's lifetime, kept either in his custody or with various Companions, why was 'Umar afraid of losing the Qur'ān through the *ḥuffāẓ's* martyrdom? This once again involves the law of witness.

Numbering in their thousands, the *ḥuffāẓ* attained Qur'ānic knowledge through the one relevant authority on earth, the Prophet. After his death they became the relevant authorities themselves; their deaths threatened to terminate the testimony leading back to the Prophet, making the acquisition of authorized knowledge impossible. So too would the verses penned by their hands lose all merit, their owners buried and unable to verify their authenticity. Even if a fragment coincided perfectly with the Qur'ān as memorized by others, in lieu of a suitable first-class witness it became at best a third-class legal document. That is why in compiling the *Ṣuḥuf*, Abū Bakr insisted that every person bring not only verses but also two witnesses to attest that the dictation came directly from the Prophet (we find this law of witness invoked again during 'Uthmān's reign). Written verses would of course remain on shelves and in cupboards regardless of whether the Yamāmah soil soaked up the *ḥuffāẓ's* blood, but the authority of witness, that essential point upon which the entire value of every document hinged, was what 'Umar dreaded forfeiting.

3. Transmutation of Islam into Foreign Idioms

A second gateway for an attack on the Qur'ān is the wholesale conversion of Islamic studies into foreign terminology. In his *Introduction to Islamic Law*, Schacht divides Islamic jurisprudence into the following headings: persons, property, obligations in general, obligations and contracts in particular, *etc.*[5] This arrangement deliberately transmutes Islamic Law into Roman Law as it has no relevance whatsoever with the headings and classifications used in the Islamic legal system; the implication of course is that it is wholly derivative of Roman Law. J. Wansbrough does the same with the Qur'ān, dividing his *Quranic Studies* along the following lines: Principles of Exegesis (1) Masoretic exegesis; (2) Haggadic exegesis; (3) Deutungsbedürftigkeit; (4) Halakhic exegesis; and (5) Rhetoric and allegory.[6]

These exegeses take up over half the book, yet if I were to approach any Muslim scholar living in the East or even educated in the West, he would not be able to decipher even the table of contents. Yes, perhaps a Jewish theologian can decode this OT terminology, but this is akin to placing the garbs of a Muslim *sheikh* on a rabbi. Why this insistence on transmuting Islam, unless it be to force it beyond the scope of Muslim scholars and imply its derivation from biblical sources?

---

[5] J. Schacht, *An Introduction to Islamic Law*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1964, Contents Table.

[6] J. Wansbrough, *Quranic Studies*, Contents.

4. Allegations of Biblical Forgery

This leads us to a third gateway for an assault on the Qur'ān: the recurrent accusations leveled against Islam as merely a forgery of Judaism and Christianity, a fraudulent offshoot appropriating Scriptural literature for its own purposes. Wansbrough, himself a firm proponent of this idea, insisted for example that "Islamic Doctrine generally, and even the figure of Muḥammad were modeled on Rabbinic Jewish prototype".[7] Here we assess the sentiments of two scholars writing in a similar vein.

i. Accusations of Botched Appropriation

In an *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1891) article T. Nöldeke, a pioneer Orientalist, mentions numerous errors in the Qur'ān due to the "ignorance of Muḥammad" concerning early Jewish history – a supposed bungling of names and details which he stole from Jewish sources.[8] Tabulating these mistakes he states that,

> [Even the] most ignorant Jew could never have mistaken Haman (the minister of Ahasuerus) for the minister of Pharaoh, or identified Miriam the sister of Moses with Mary (= Miriam) the mother of Christ.... [And] in his ignorance of everything out of Arabia, he makes the fertility of Egypt – where rain is almost never seen and never missed – depend on rain instead of the inundations of the Nile (xii. 49).[9]

In his deceit Nöldeke neglects to point out that the Qur'ān refers to Mary the mother of Christ as "sister of Aaron",[10] not Moses. Aaron was the first in line for the Israelite priesthood. According to the New Testament Elizabeth, cousin of Mary and mother of John the Baptist, came of a priestly family and

---

[7] See R.S. Humphreys, *Islamic History: A Framework for Inquiry*, Revised edition, Princeton Univ. Press, 1991, p. 84.

[8] See "The Koran", *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 9th edition, 1891, vol. 16, pp. 597ff. Reprinted in Ibn Warraq (ed.), *The Origins of the Koran: Classic Essays on Islam's Holy Book*, Prometheus Books, Amherst, NY, 1998, pp. 36-63.

[9] T. Nöldeke, "The Koran", in Ibn Warraq (ed.), *The Origins of the Koran*, p. 43.

[10] Qur'ān 19:28.

was thus "of the daughters of Aaron".[11] By extension we can just as convincingly designate either Mary or Elizabeth as "sisters of Aaron" or "daughters of ʿImrān", Aaron's father.[12] As for Hamān the argument is that his name must have come from the Bible, insinuating that no other notable by that name existed in history. Who is to say that Pharaoh did not also have a close associate by that name, simply because earlier scriptures failed to mention him? In the Bible his sole appearance is in the book of Esther, largely regarded as a work of fantasy.[13] Contrary to his role in Esther no record exists of a Hamān, or any other non-Perisan, being second-in-command to Xerxes (Ahasuerus) at any time.[14] But reference to Hamān is in fact found in the Egyptian hieroglyphs, as a name for the chief of the stone quarry workers during the New Kingdom Period.[15] This occupation fits the Qur'ānic sense perfectly, and the era coincides with the time of Moses.[16] Not until the 19th century did Hieroglyphic rise from dead language to decipherable text again, and this only demonstrates the miraculous nature of the Qur'ān and its divine origin.

What of Nöldeke's claim regarding Egyptian fertility? The inundations of the Nile are due in most part to variability of rainfall at its source, as any ecologist will attest, but let us put that aside. Verse 12:49 reads:

﴿ ثُمَّ يَأۡتِي مِنۢ بَعۡدِ ذَٰلِكَ عَامٞ فِيهِ يُغَاثُ ٱلنَّاسُ وَفِيهِ يَعۡصِرُونَ ٤٩ ﴾

> "Then after that [period] will come a year in which the people will be delivered, and in which they will press [wine and oil]."

I will leave the reader to extract any reference to rain; in fact this accusation stems from Nöldeke confusing the nouns for 'rain' and 'deliverance'.

---

[11] Luke 1:5. See also Luke 1:36.

[12] Refer to Yusuf Ali's translation of the Holy Qur'ān, commentaries for verses 3:35 and 19:28.

[13] Typical is the stance of The Jewish Encyclopedia, that "the vast majority of modern expositors have reached the conclusion that the book is a piece of pure fiction, although some writers qualify their criticism by an attempt to treat it as a historical romance" ["Esther", *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1905, v:236]. *The Oxford Companion to the Bible* likewise states that "in terms of literary genre the book is not history....[it] is best understood as a novella" [p. 199].

[14] L.E. Keck *et al.* (eds.), *The New Interpreter's Bible: General Articles & Introduction, Commentary, & Reflections for each Book of the Bible, Including the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books*, Abingdon Press, 1994, iii:859.

[15] M. Bucaille, *Moses and Pharaoh: The Hebrews in Egypt*, NTT Mediascope Inc., 1995, pp. 192-93.

[16] The approximate dates for the New Kingdom Period are 1575-1087 B.C.E. and most scholars concur that Moses lived during the reign of Ramses II, thereby dating the Exodus to the mid 13th century B.C.E. [*The Oxford Companion to the Bible*, pp. 180, 210].

ii. A Counterfeited Bible

This is the charge directed against the Qur'ān by Hirschfeld.[17] If by Bible he refers to the NT, let us recall two of the major doctrines in Christianity: Original Sin and Atonement. The former is the automatic inheritance of every human, being the progeny of Adam, whilst the latter embodies the belief that God sacrificed His only begotten Son as the sole means of absolving this sin. The Qur'ān categorically rejects both:

﴿ فَتَلَقَّىٰٓ ءَادَمُ مِن رَّبِّهِۦ كَلِمَٰتٍ فَتَابَ عَلَيۡهِ ﴾[18]

> "Thereupon Adam received words [of guidance] from his Lord, and He accepted his repentance."

﴿ وَلَا تَكۡسِبُ كُلُّ نَفۡسٍ إِلَّا عَلَيۡهَاۚ وَلَا تَزِرُ وَازِرَةٞ وِزۡرَ أُخۡرَىٰ ﴾[19]

> "And whatever [wrong] any human commits rests upon himself alone; and no bearer of burdens shall be made to bear another's burden."

The Trinity and salvation through Christ, the very essences of Christian doctrine, find only outright dismissal in the Qur'ān, while the biblical stories present therein are more a matter of history than ideology.

﴿ قُلۡ هُوَ ٱللَّهُ أَحَدٌ ١ ٱللَّهُ ٱلصَّمَدُ ٢ لَمۡ يَلِدۡ وَلَمۡ يُولَدۡ ٣ وَلَمۡ يَكُن لَّهُۥ
كُفُوًا أَحَدُۢ ٤ ﴾[20]

> "Say: He is Allāh, the One and Only; Allāh, the Eternal, Absolute; He begets not, nor is He begotten; and there is none like unto Him."

So where exactly does this counterfeiting manifest itself? And concerning appropriations from the OT (as alleged by Wansbrough, Nöldeke and others), why should the Prophet seek to emulate a Scripture portraying Yahweh as a tribal God, affiliated not even with the Samaritans or Edomites but solely with Israel? At the very opening of the Book we find:

﴿ بِسۡمِ ٱللَّهِ ٱلرَّحۡمَٰنِ ٱلرَّحِيمِ ١ ٱلۡحَمۡدُ لِلَّهِ رَبِّ ٱلۡعَٰلَمِينَ ٢ ﴾[21]

> "In the Name of Allāh, Most Gracious, Most Merciful. Praise be to Allāh, the Cherisher and Sustainer of the Worlds."

---

[17] A. Mingana, "The Transmission of the Koran", in Ibn Warraq (ed.), *The Origins of the Koran*, p. 112.

[18] Qur'ān 2:37.

[19] Qur'ān 6:164.

[20] Qur'ān 112:1-4.

[21] Qur'ān 1:1-2.

A universal invocation to Allāh, transcending tribes and races and based only on the precepts of faith. One cannot pluck such a rich mango from the prickly arms of a cactus.

5. Deliberate Distortion of the Qur'ān

A fourth gateway is to falsify the Holy Book itself. We have already critically explored Goldziher and Arthur Jeffery's theories on variants, but there are other notables as well.

i. Blachère's Attempted Distortion of the Qur'ān

In translating the Qur'ān into French (*Le Coran*, 1949), Regis Blachère not only changes the sūra order in the Qur'ān but adds two fictitious verses into the body of the text. He bases this on a spurious narration in which Satan made his own 'revelations' to the Prophet, who was apparently incapable of telling apart the Words of Allāh from the polytheistic mumblings in the story. None of the transmission channels for recitation and none of the 250,000 extant Qur'ānic manuscripts contain these two verses which, by themselves, wholly contradict everything preceding them and following them, and in fact the very essence of the Qur'ān.[22]

Labeled '20 *bis*' and '20 *ter*', the fake verses are a call to Muslims to glorify the idols of pre-Islamic Makkah.[23]

This fraudulent report has proven too charming for Orientalists to pass up. *Sirat Ibn Isḥāq*, an early and definitive biography of the Prophet, was translated by Rev. Guillaume and this has enjoyed immense success, being published continuously in non-Arab Muslim countries since 1967. In this translation Guillaume resorts to dishonesties too numerous to mention. Among them is the insertion of two pages from one of aṭ-Ṭabarī's works, in which aṭ-Ṭabarī recounts this spurious tale for its curiosity value. Guillaume never indicates his external quotations clearly, flanking them with parentheses instead of setting them apart from the main body of text, and preceding them with a 'Ṭ' which is vigorously employed but never explained. This lengthy narrative of two pages benefits from the same

---

[22] For a detailed discussion on this see 'Urwah b. az-Zubair, *al-Maghāzī*, pp. 106-10, in particular the footnotes.

[23] Counterfeit verses aside, Blachère (and others such as Rodwell and Richard Bell) alter the order of sūras in their translations, challenging again the holiness of the text in a convenient way given Western views regarding the alleged sūra arrangement in Ibn Mas'ūd's Muṣḥaf.

86 N° 30 = SOURATE LIII

19 Avez-vous considéré al-Lât et al-ʿOzzâ

20 et Manât, cette troisième autre.

20 *bis* Ce sont les Sublimes Déesses

20 *ter* et leur intercession est certes souhaitée.

21 Avez-vous le Mâle et, Lui, la Femelle !

22 Cela, alors, serait un partage inique !

24 L'Homme a-t-il ce qu'il désire ?

25 A Allah appartiennent la [*Vie*] Dernière et Première.

23 Ce ne sont que des noms dont vous les avez nommées, vous et vos pères. Allah ne fit descendre, avec elles, aucune probation(*sulṭân*). Vous ne suivez que votre conjecture et ce que désirent vos âmes alors que certes, à vos pères, est venue la Direction de leur Seigneur.

III. — Les vt. suivants traitent eux aussi de l'intercession et de l'appellation, féminine, en arabe, donnée aux Anges. Par suite de leur assonance, il a pu paraître naturel de les lier aux précédents. Ils sont cependants postérieurs

20 *bis* et 20 *ter*. Le texte de ces deux vt. se trouve dans *GdQ*, 100, note 4 avec références et variantes ; cf. *Introd.*, 242.

21. Ce vt. est éclairé par le n° 22 = LII, 39.

23. *Vous les avez... avec elles*. Ces deux pronoms représentent les trois divinités mentionnées dans les vt. 19-20. ‖ *Vous ne suivez*. Au lieu de cette var. canonique, la Vulgate porte : *ils ne suivent*. L'idée est la suivante : « Vous êtes actuellement dans l'erreur de même que vos ancêtres qui, pourtant, eux aussi, ont reçu l'enseignement divin. »

24. La particule *'am* n'est pas uniquement adversative, mais aussi interrogative. Elle sous-entend toutefois, dans ce dernier cas, un énoncé qui va contraster avec une idée précédente.

Figure 19.1: Blachère's translation with the two fictitious verses, '20 bis*' and '20* ter*'.*

treatment,[24] and naturally the lay Muslim swallows truth with polytheistic fiction and unwittingly accepts the tale as a definitive part of Ibn Isḥāq's serious historical work.

ii. Mingana's Attempted Distortion of the Qur'ān

Prof. Rev. Mingana, held by some as 'a great scholar of Arabic',[25] has in fact a shaky grasp of the subject at best. Publishing *An Important Manuscript of the Traditions of Bukhārī*[26] he commits, in copying only a handful

---

[24] See A. Guillaume, *The Life of Muhammad: A Translation of Ibn Isḥāq's Sīrat Rasūl Allāh*, 8th impression, Oxford Univ. Press, Karachi, 1987, p. 165.

[25] Ibn Warraq (ed.), *Origins of the Koran*, p. 410.

[26] Cambridge, 1936.

of lines, the following blunders: incorrect transcription of وحدثني (which he transcribes as وخدمني); also أبو الفضل بن read as أبو المظفر; omission of such words as مقابلة; inability to read partial words such as إجازة (which he conveniently drops altogether); addition of an extra و; erroneous translation of the terms ثنا and أنا, and so on, in a series of errors that can only be classed as incompetence.

The *Traditions of Bukhārī* is of course a *ḥadīth* compilation, and I use this simply as a test case. Returning to the Qur'ān we find that here too Mingana leaves behind a legacy, publishing a work entitled *Leaves from Three Ancient Qurâns, Possibly Pre-ʿOthmânic with a list of their Variants.*[27]

Figure 19.2: One of the palimpsest leaves used by Mingana. Source: Mingana & Lewis (eds.), Leaves from Three Ancient Qurâns, *Plate Qurân B.*

The original manuscript is palimpsest in vellum: originally containing verses of the Qur'ān, the ink was subsequently washed off and written over by a Christian Arab.[28] Making out the initial text is certainly demanding, so Mingana showers three pages with infrared light to increase contrast.[29]

---

[27] Cambridge, 1914.

[28] The two writings are perpendicular to one another. Palimpsest refers to a parchment or tablet that has been written upon more than once with the earlier text, imperfectly erased, remaining partly visible.

Analyzing the leaves, Mingana lists the Qur'ānic variants in this manuscript along with an English translation. It is not difficult to detect his incredible dishonesty in this regard, aimed especially at readers with little knowledge of Arabic. The following four variants will clarify:

1. Mingana writes:

> "Unless اللكم (or اللك) means *blow*, *fist*, *boxing*, it is an obscure word. The sentence of the [printed] Qur'ān is as follows: انهم لن يغنوا عنك من الله شيئا 'They will not take the place of Allāh in anything, for thee (Muḥammad).' Our text is:
>
> انهم لن يغنوا عنك من اللكم (اللك or) هكما
>
> 'In derision, they will not take the place of a blow, for thee.' If this sense is rejected, the real meaning of this substantive would be problematic. The *Kāmūs* has simply: الضرب باليد مجموعة اللكز والدفع. The abstract substantive هكْم, in its tri-literal form instead of the form تفعّل is not much used in the post-Qur'ānic compositions, but the adjective هكِم is found in good writers."[30]

Notes: So much linguistic gymnastics, and all for a moot point. Keeping in mind his inability to read even the lucid manuscripts of al-Bukhārī, not to speak of palimpsests, Mingana's translation here is patently false because the ending makes no conceivable sense in this context. The word اللكم squarely belongs in the boxing arena, not the Qur'ān, and the most charitable rendering I can give is, 'Out of wickedness they will not protect you from the punch [*sic*]'. That the final two words are due to scribal error is glaringly obvious (what scribe would deliberately try to alter this verse by inserting such absurdities?), but Mingana refuses to give up.

2. From sūra 17:1[31]

Printed Qur'ān (as given by Mingana):	حوله	باركنا
Mingana's manuscript:	حوله	بركنا

Notes: Anyone perusing the Muṣḥaf now printed in Madinah will find that the published spelling is بٰركنا, not باركنا. So Mingana inserts the *alif* of his own accord in the first instance, then leaves it out in the second to create a

---

[29] Mingana and Smith (eds.), *Leaves from Three Ancient Qurâns*, Plate Qurân B.

[30] *ibid*, p. xxxvii.

[31] *ibid*, p. xxxviii.

'variant'. Also, the word *barak* (برك) means blessing as well as to kneel, and of this he takes advantage by translating the first line (with his added *alif*) as 'blessed', and the second as 'knelt'.

3. From sūra 9:37[32]

Printed Qur'ān (as given by Mingana):	[الكافرين]	القوم	لا يهدى
Mingana's manuscript:	[الكافرين]	لقوم	لا يهدا

Notes: It is no *secret that early scribes occasionally dropped* vowels (و, ا, and ي) in their copies,[33] and here the writer dispensed with the final vowel in يهدى because it is silent. Once again Mingana takes advantage, this time through a ludicrous transposition. He separates the *alif* from القوم and places it after لا يهد, creating a new ungrammatical phrase that is bereft of all meaning. This is analogous to taking the phrase 'tigers hunting' and converting it to 'tiger shunting'.

4. From sūra 40:85[34]

Printed Qur'ān (as given by Mingana):	ايمانهم	ينفعهم	يك	فلم
Mingana's manuscript:	ايمانهم	نفعهم	يكن	فلم

Notes: The same trick is employed here, though with somewhat more sophistication. Transposing the 'يـ' from ينفعهم to يك, Mingana creatively adds his own dots to the dotless text to form يكن.

6. Puin and the Sanʿā' Fragments

In his contribution to *The Qur'ān as Text*, Gerd-R. Joseph Puin alludes to the peculiarities found in the Yemeni hoards:[35]

- Defective writing of *alif*. These are more common in the Ṣanʿā' fragments than in others.
- Variations in the position of āyah separators within certain verses.
- The 'greatest' find is a fragment where the end of sūra 26 is followed by sūra 37.

In authoring "What is the Koran?" for the January 1999 issue of *The Atlantic Monthly*, Toby Lester heavily relied on G.R. Puin's discoveries. One of the main figures in the restoration of the Muṣḥafs in Ṣan'ā', Yemen,[36] Puin found himself and the Yemeni fragments thrust into the spotlight with the article's publication. Lester's words occasioned both sensational joy and deep anger concerning Puin's work, depending on whether one spoke with Orientalists or devout Muslims, so to counter the anger of the Muslim street and wipe clean the distrust, Puin wrote a lengthy letter in Arabic to al-Qāḍī al-Akwa' of Yemen. The letter then appeared in the Yemeni daily ath-Thawra newspaper, and I have reproduced it elsewhere.[37] Praising the Ṣan'ā' Muṣḥafs and how they fortified the Muslim position, he nevertheless wrote with enough subtlety and vagueness to cast a pall over the whole history of the Qur'ān. Following is a translation of part of the letter that is related to this theme:

---

[32] Mingana, *Leaves from Three Ancient Qurâns*, p. xxxviii. He cites the same wording for verse 9:24.

[33] See pp. 144 - 45.

[34] Mingana, *Leaves from Three Ancient Qurâns*, p. xxxix.

[35] See G.R. Puin, "Observations on Early Qur'an Manuscripts in Ṣanʿā'", in S. Wild (ed.), *The Qur'an as Text*, p. 111.

> The remnants [of these old Muṣḥafs] go back, scientifically assured, to the first century after Hijra! Because of the existence of these manuscripts in Ṣan'ā', … [we have] the only monumental proof of the completion of the Qur'ān in the first century of Hijra and not, as so many non-Muslim scholars assert, from the early third century of Hijra! Of course Muslims may ask what is the point of such information from a non-Muslim scholar, when Muslims are certain that the complete Muṣḥaf has existed ever since the third Caliph, 'Uthmān b. 'Affān. Theirs is simply a belief held in good faith, since we do not have the original copy of the Muṣḥaf which was written under the supervision of 'Uthmān, nor any of the further copies which he dispatched to other territories….

A summary of his main points runs thus:

1. The Ṣan'ā' manuscripts are the *only* proof of the Qur'ān's completion by the first century of Hijra, a solid refutation against the many non-Muslim scholars who claim that it was not completed until the early third.
2. Muslims possess no proof that the complete Muṣḥaf has existed since 'Uthmān's reign. Good faith is their sole buttress.

Most of Puin's claims have been dealt with: the irregularities of writing *alif* were covered extensively in Chapters 10 and 12; his triumphant discovery of a fragment where sūra 26 is followed by sūra 37 is not the least bit unique as I have shown from other partial Muṣḥafs, see pp. 78-81. As regards misplacement of some āyah separators, incongruities in this area

---

[36] For a detailed description see al-Qāḍī al-Akwa', "The Mosque of Ṣan'ā': A Leading Islamic Monument in Yemen", in *Maṣāḥif Ṣan'ā'*, pp. 9-24 (Arabic section).

[37] The entire text appeared in the issue dated 24.11.1419 A.H. I have reproduced part of it as Figure 1.1.

have already been noted and catalogued by early Muslim scholars. The one claim that we have not elaborated on is discussed next.

i. Are the San'ā' Fragments the Only Proof of the Qur'ān's Completion by the First Century?

Puin makes two intertwining assertions. He pulls the date for the Qur'ān's completion from the third century to the first but then, by refraining from anything more specific, subtly opens up a wide timeframe within which to work.

Not all Orientalists allege that the Qur'ān was completed in the early third century. There are some, *e.g.* Rev. Mingana, who argue that it was completed by the first, and yet others, *e.g.* Muir, who hold that the present Muṣḥaf is identical to the text given by the Prophet. Then there is al-Ḥajjāj (*d.* 95 A.H.), to whom many Western scholars give credit for the Qur'ān's final recording. All these dates belong to the first century, and Puin's imprecision leaves the door open for assigning any date within this period. Precision is a key element of serious scholarship, however, and one we must abide by. With the Prophet's passing in early 11 A.H. the revelations arrived at their natural end. They were compiled into their external form during the reign of Abū Bakr (*d.* 13 A.H.), and the spelling standardized and copies dispatched by 'Uthmān (25-30 A.H.). That is the Muslim view. Never have Muslims alleged that the complete Qur'ān did not materialize until 'Uthmān, and if Puin claims this then he certainly does not speak on behalf of any Muslim tongue.

Several dozen first-century manuscripts of the Qur'ān exist in various libraries around the world;[38] my personal guess is that, worldwide, there are about one quarter of one million partial or complete Muṣḥaf manuscripts covering all eras.[39] Below is a list of some of these which have been conclusively dated to the first century A.H. In compiling this I relied on the work of K. ʿAwwād,[40] picking only the first-century Muṣḥafs from his own list (in boldfaced numbers) and then rearranging the entries by name.[41]

---

[38] Interestingly, there are approximately 2,327 copies of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* worldwide, as mentioned in the catalogue *al-Fihris as-Shāmil li at-Turāth al-'Arabī al-Islāmī al-Makhṭūṭ: al-Ḥadīth an-Nabawī ash-Sharīf wa 'Ulūmahu wa Rijāluhu* [Āl al-Bait Foundation, 'Ammān, 1991, i:493-565]. In view of this vast number (though the catalogue is neither very accurate nor comprehensive), it is quite safe to assume that the number of Muṣḥaf manuscripts is many folds this figure.

[39] This is a conservative figure and in reality it may easily exceed it. The collection at *Türk ve Islâm Eserleri Müzesi* in Istanbul is estimated to contain about 210,000 folios [F. Déroche, "The Qur'ān of Amāgūr", *Manuscripts of the Middle East*, Leiden, 1990-91, vol. 5, p. 59]. There are also "… about 40 thousand sheets of old parchment and paper of Qur'anic text from the Great Mosque of San'ā' …" [G.R. Puin, "Methods of Research on Qur'anic Manuscripts – A Few Ideas", in *Maṣāḥif Ṣan'ā'*, p. 9]. There are many sizable collections in other parts of the world. Recently a new Muṣḥaf attributed to 'Uthmān has been uncovered, manuscript E20 at the

1. **[1]** A copy attributed to Caliph ʿUthmān bin ʿAffān. Amanat Khizana, Topkapi Sarayi, Istanbul, no. 1.[42]
2. **[2]** Another copy ascribed to ʿUthmān bin ʿAffān. Amanat Khizana, Topkapi Sarayi, no. 208. This copy has some 300 folios and is missing a portion from both ends.
3. **[3]** Another ascribed to ʿUthmān bin ʿAffān. Amanat Khizana, Topkapi Sarayi, no. 10. It is only 83 folios and contains notes in the Turkish language naming the scribe.
4. **[12]** Attributed to Caliph ʿUthmān at the Museum of Islamic Art, Istanbul. It lacks folios from the beginning, middle and end. Al-Munaggid dates it to the second half of the first century.[43]
5. **[43]** Attributed to Caliph ʿUthmān in Tashkent, 353 folios.
6. **[46]** A large copy with 1000 pages, written between 25-31 A.H. at Rawāq al-Maghāriba, al-Azhar, Cairo.

Oriental Institute, St. Petersburg. For a facsimile edition see E. Rezvan, *The Qur'ān of ʿUthmān (St. Petersburg, Katta-Langar, Bukhara, Tashkent)*, St. Petersburg Center for Oriental Studies, St. Petersburg, 2004. This Muṣḥaf was (along with others ascribed to Caliph ʿUthmān) detailed in Chapter 11.

[40] K. ʿAwwād, *Aqdam al-Makhṭūṭāt al-ʿArabiyya fī Maktabāt al-ʿĀlam*, pp. 31-59.

[41] A few points regarding this list:

- Though a good number of these Muṣḥafs were supposedly penned by this or that individual, we cannot confirm or deny these claims since the manuscripts themselves are mute on this point. Other sources, mostly anonymous, have supplied the scribes' identities. For approximate dating we must do our own homework. Where a Muṣḥaf is ascribed to ʿUthmān *etc.*, it may well mean for example that the scribe copied it from a Muṣḥaf dispatched by ʿUthmān.
- Many new writings have been discovered which assist us in tracking the evolution of a script. An ugly-looking script does not necessarily precede a more attractive one, date wise, and I have encountered one such example myself: crude inscriptions in Baraqa Palace versus more polished, earlier ones from the same region. [Ibrāhīm Jumʿa, *Dirāsāt fī Taṭawwur al-Kitāba al-Kūfiyya*, p. 127.] A Muṣḥaf penned in a beautiful hand does not inevitably mean that it is of a later date; this unfortunately has been the attitude of al-Munaggid and others, who blindly acquiesced to some unproven theories.

[42] For an excellent study of this Muṣḥaf and facsimile see, Tayyar Altikulaç, *Al-Muṣḥaf Al-Sharif Attributed to ʿUthmān bin ʿAffān (The copy at the Topkapi Palace Museum)*, Research Center for Islamic History, Art and Culture (IRCICA), Istanbul, 2007.

[43] For a detailed study of this Muṣḥaf and facsimile see, Dr. Tayyar Altikulaç, *Hz. Osman'a Nisbet Edilen Mushaf-I Şerîf (Türk ve Islâm Eserleri Müzesi Nüshasi)*, Islâm Arastirmalari Merkezi (ISAM), Istanbul, 1428/2007.

7. **[58]** Attributed to Caliph ʿUthmān. The Egyptian Library, Cairo.
8. **[4]** Ascribed to Caliph ʿAlī bin Abī Ṭālib on palimpsest. Muzesi Kutuphanesi, Topkapi Sarayi, no. 36E.H.29. It has 147 folios.
9. **[5]** Ascribed to Caliph ʿAlī. Amanat Khizana, Topkapi Sarayi, no. 33. Only 48 folios.
10. **[11]** Ascribed to Caliph ʿAlī. Amanat Khizana, Topkapi Sarayi, no. 25E.H.2. Contains 414 Folios.
11. **[37]** Ascribed to Caliph ʿAlī. Raza Library, Rampur, India, no. 1. Contains 343 Folios.
12. **[42]** Ascribed to Caliph ʿAlī, Ṣanʿā', Yemen.
13. **[57]** Ascribed to Caliph ʿAlī, al-Mashhad al-Ḥusainī, Cairo.
14. **[84]** Ascribed to Caliph ʿAlī, 127 folios. Najaf, Iraq.
15. **[85]** Ascribed to Caliph ʿAlī. Also in Najaf, Iraq.
16. **[80]** Attributed to Ḥusain b. ʿAlī (*d.* 50 A.H.), 41 folios, Mashhad, Iran.
17. **[81]** Attributed to Ḥasan b. ʿAlī, 124 folios, Mashhad, Iran, no. 12.
18. **[86]** Attributed to Ḥasan b. ʿAlī, 124 folios. Najaf, Iraq.
19. **[50]** A copy, 332 folios, most likely from the early first half of the first century. The Egyptian Library, Cairo, no. 139 Maṣāḥif.
20. **[6]** Ascribed to Khudaij b. Muʿāwiya (*d.* 63 A.H.) written in 49 A.H. Amanat Khizana, Topkapi Sarayi, no. 44. It has 226 folios.
21. **[8]** A Muṣḥaf in Kufic script penned in 74 A.H. Amanat Khizana, Topkapi Sarayi, no. 2. It has 406 folios.
22. **[49]** A copy scribed by al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī in 77 A.H. The Egyptian Library, Cairo, no. 50 Maṣāḥif.
23. **[13]** A copy in the Museum of Islamic Art, Istanbul, no. 358. According to al-Munaggid it belongs to the late first century.
24. **[75]** A copy with 112 folios. The British Museum, London.
25. **[51]** A copy with 27 folios. The Egyptian Library, Cairo, no. 247.
26. **[96]** Some 5000 folios from different manuscripts at the Bibliotheque Nationale de France, many from the first century. One of them, Arabe 328(a), has lately been published as a facsimile edition.

This is not an exhaustive list: items in private collections would easily boost this tally (though access to them dangles precariously on the owner's temperament), and Muslims as a whole do not enjoy any equivalent to the Münster Institute of the New Testament Textual Research in Germany.[44] The collection at *Türk ve Islâm Eserleri Müzesi* in Istanbul, potentially even more significant than the Ṣanʿā' fragments, still awaits dedicated scholars.

---

[44] The duty of this office is to register every manuscript of the New Testament, be it a 2×3cm fragment or a lectionary. See B. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, pp. 260-63.

Regardless, the list above shows that many complete (and semi-complete) Muṣḥafs have survived from Islam's earliest days, and among them may well be ones predating ʿUthmān's Muṣḥaf.

Though certainly a great treasure containing a wealth of orthographic oddities, the Muṣḥafs in Ṣanʿāʾ do not add anything new or substantial to the body of proof which already establishes the Qurʾān's completion within the first decades of Islam.

7. Conclusion

Schacht, Wansbrough, Nöldeke, Hirschfeld, Jeffrey, Blachère, Guillaume, Mingana, and Puin are not the only players on the field. All Orientalists must, to varying extents, approach the Qurʾān with duplicity if they are to distort it, whether by transmutation, deliberate mistranslation, willful ignorance, use of spurious references, or other means. Prof. J. Bellamy has composed a few articles to amend certain 'scribal errors' found in the text,[45] and in this endeavor he is by no means a lone figure. The recent past has witnessed a rising chorus of Orientalists demanding a systematic revision of the Qurʾān. Hans Kung, a Roman Catholic theologian who found discourse with Islam to be at an impasse, advised Muslims in the late 1980s to admit to the element of human authorship in their Holy Book.[46]

Likewise Kenneth Cragg, an Anglican bishop, urged Muslims to rethink the traditional Islamic concept of *waḥy*, "probably as a concession by Muslims in the current pluralist spirit of interfaith dialogue".[47] In a later piece entitled "The Historical Geography of the Qurʾān", he proposed abrogating the Madanī verses (with their political and legal emphases) in favor of their Makkan counterparts, which are more focused on basic issues of monotheistic faith, signifying that political Islam deserves no shelter in a world of secular democracies and Roman Law. This abrogation, he ventured, can be imposed by appealing to the consensus of like-minded laymen and simply bypassing the opinion of Muslim scholars.[48]

---

[45] See "Al-Raqim or al-Ruqud? A note on Surah 18:9", *JAOS*, vol. cxi (1991), pp. 115-17; "Fa-Ummuhu Hawiyah: A Note on Surah 101:9", *JAOS*, vol. cxii (1992), pp. 485-87; "Some Proposed Emendations to the Text of the Koran", *JAOS*, vol. cxiii (1993), pp. 562-73; and "More Proposed Emendations to the Text of the Koran", *JAOS*, vol. cxvi (1996), pp. 196-204.

[46] Peter Ford, "The Qurʾān as Sacred Scripture," *Muslim World*, vol. lxxxiii, no. 2 (April 1993), p. 156.

[47] A. Saeed, "Rethinking 'Revelation' as a Precondition for Reinterpreting the Qur'an: A Qur'anic Perspective", *JQS*, i:93, quoting K. Cragg, *Troubled by Truth*, Pentland Press, 1992, p. 3.

[48] *ibid*, i:81-92.

The Qurʾān states:

﴿وَأَنزَلْنَآ إِلَيْكَ ٱلذِّكْرَ لِتُبَيِّنَ لِلنَّاسِ مَا نُزِّلَ إِلَيْهِمْ وَلَعَلَّهُمْ يَتَفَكَّرُونَ ٤٤﴾[49]

> "We have revealed unto you the Remembrance [the Qurʾān], that you may explain to humanity that which has been revealed for them and in order that they may give thought."

The Prophet will forever remain the only sanctioned expounder of the Holy Book, his *sunna* a practical guide to its implementation and the reference point as to which exegetical threads are permissible and which are not. In seeking to divorce the two, let alone to divorce one half of the Qurʾān from the other, Orientalists thoroughly ignore the myriad rules which govern the interpretation of *all* laws and statutes, and which prevent even the majority of the learned from dipping their fingers into this business, to say nothing of the uninformed layman. Their theories imply that everyone is welcome to dethrone the commands of Allāh even if meddling with secular state law remains firmly out of the question.

With Scriptural corruptions taken for granted as the norm, many scholars feel impelled to dip the Qurʾān into the same muddied cauldron without realizing that the ideal they wish to discredit, one of certainty and flawless preservation, can and really does exist. In this regard Hartmut Bobzin writes,

> Christian polemics against the Koran or Islam as a whole is of much more interest for European 'Geistsgeschichte' than for Islamic studies in the stricter sense. Many of the topics which were handed over again and again had nothing to do with real Islam.[50]

He draws an analogy to the Guardi brothers who, in 18th century Italy, devised a series of 'Turkish paintings' by mimicking contemporary Turkish artists in a particular way.

> Thus, 'Oriental sujets' as painted by the Guardis are mostly examples of their own imagination as to how the Orient must be conceived.[51]

What the Guardis intended is not so different from the portraits that Orientalism paints of Islam. A small wonder then that so much of Orientalist research runs counter to Muslim faith, since its fantasy of how the East "must be conceived" is hatched in a distinctly political world.

---

[49] Qurʾān 16:44.

[50] H. Bobzin, "A Treasury of Heresies", in S. Wild (ed.), *The Qur'an as Text*, p. 174.

[51] *ibid*, p. 174. Italics added.

CHAPTER TWENTY

ORIENTALIST MOTIVATIONS: A STUDY OF SUBJECTIVITY

Despite all its tendencies against Islamic tradition, Orientalism insists that it is performing a service for Muslims by providing them with pure, impartial, objective research. The implication is that a Muslim scholar, blinded by faith, cannot know right from wrong when analyzing his own beliefs.[1] If there is truth to this then we must be willing to inspect Orientalism in relation to *its* beliefs and overriding principles, for branding one group as biased does not automatically justify the other group's claim to objectivity. Exploring the roots of Orientalism necessitates delving into politics, past and present, to gain some insight into its motivations that the reader may better weigh its research on the Qur'ān accordingly.

1. The Jewish Analogue

Before discussing Orientalism I will raise an analogous question: in Jewish opinion, can an anti-Semitic scholar be deemed impartial when examining Jewish documents such as the OT or the Dead Sea Scrolls? Whatever verdict we receive, affirmative or negative, we must then apply to the question of Orientalism and its supposed objectivity in dissecting Islam.

i. The Validity of an Anti-Semitic Work

Friedrich Delitzsch, a Christian scholar and one of the founding fathers of Assyriology, hailed from a tradition of eminent OT scholarship and was himself of partly Jewish origin.[2] His view on the OT was, however, singularly unsympathetic:

> The Old Testament is full of all kinds of deceptions: a veritable hodgepodge of erroneous, incredible, undependable figures, including those

---

[1] I was informed by a colleague that Dr. Wadād al-Qāḍī (University of Chicago) has declared Muslim scholars unfit to engage in any research on the Qur'ān, because of their faith. This is hardly surprising; a few years ago she presented a paper in Cairo which stated that Muslim scholars must admit to the 'authority' of Western research on Islam. In her eyes their lack of faith was a definite plus to their credentials.

[2] John Bright, *The Authority of the Old Testament*, Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1967, pp. 65-66.

Refuting his views, Hershel Shanks cites at length the numerous non-Israelite cultures in the area which have recently seen a scholarly revival: Philistines, Edomites, Moabites, Arameans, Hurrians, Canaanites. He accuses Whitelam of politicizing history.[18]

In perusing Shanks' rebuttal I was struck that nowhere does he refer to Islamic history, or to any associated scholarly revival. Is this casual disregard not "part of the complex arrangement" through which Whitelam sees Palestinians being denied their rightful authority and land? Which culture—Canaanite and Edomite and Moabite, or Muslim—best defines Palestinian self-identity? And why is it being wholly neglected? Though finally prepared to acknowledge the Palestinians' ancient customs and cultures, there is still a refusal to accord their current religion its rightful place in the history of the land. It is as though Israeli and biblical scholars view fourteen centuries of Muslim culture as so much rubbish which they must shovel through before arriving at the good stuff.

ii. An Orientalist Pioneer and Deceiver of Muslims

Returning to Orientalism, let us take one quick case study. In his *Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence* Schacht writes,

> I feel myself under a deep obligation to the masters of Islamic studies in the last generation. The name of Snouck Hurgronje appears seldom in this book; yet if we now understand the character of Muhammadan Law, it is due to him.[19]

But who was Snouck Hurgronje? An Orientalist whose agenda was to deceive the Muslim masses of Indonesia into accepting the Dutch government's colonialist exploitation: "Islam is the religion of peace," he preached, "and the duty of the Muslims according to the Sharīʿa is to follow the order of the [Dutch] rulers – and not to disobey and commit violence".[20] Traveling to Makkah to further this mantra, he alleged himself a Muslim to win broader popularity without sacrificing the full scope of his ambitions. Edward Said notes the "close cooperation between scholarship and direct military colonial conquest" inherent in "the case of the revered Dutch Orientalist C. Snouck Hurgronje, who used the confidence he had won from Muslims to plan and execute the brutal Dutch war against the Atjeyhnese people of Sumatra".[21]

And after all this he is considered a Western pioneer of Islamic Law. The point is clear. The selfsame members of Jewish intelligentsia who attack Strugnell's biases, who roundly denounce and dismiss those accused of being hostile towards Judaism, are at the same time utterly indifferent to Israeli prejudice against Muslim culture and history. Meanwhile the far greater bigotry of Hurgronje and a host of other colonialist agents and clergymen – manifesting itself not simply in words, but in deception and direct military subjugation – is casually overlooked, and their status in Western spheres as 'Orientalist pioneers' remains untouched.

3. Searching for Impartiality

i. A Historical Perspective: Jews, Christians and Romans

All Orientalist scholarship is built on the premise of the more enlightened outsider being free of biases. But has Western or Judeo-Christian tradition *ever* witnessed this supposed objectivity? Where are the jewels of wise discourse in the subjective and vulgar catalogue of historic Western writings? Vulgar, I say, because anyone can compare the reverence with which Muslim scholars treated Jesus, the Virgin Mary, Moses, Aaron, Isaac, Abraham, David, Solomon, Lot *etc.*, to the crude and wrathful ranting of Jews against Christians, of Christians against Jews, of Catholics and Protestants against each other, and of ancient Romans against everyone. Here I will quote at length Adrian Reeland, Professor of the Oriental Tongues at the University of Utrecht, who in 1705 composed a unique work in Latin, subsequently translated and published in London under the title, *Four Treatises Concerning the Doctrine, Discipline and Worship of the Mahometans* (1712).

> The *Jewish* People, tho they had the holiest Institutes and Laws that ever were ... could not escape the Spite of wicked Men, who charg'd many things upon them which were absolutely false. *Tacitus* himself, who wanted not Opportunitys of consulting the *Jews* in their own Affairs, writes that they ... were expel'd *Egypt* for the Scab; and that they consecrated the Image of an Ass, which had taught them to expel their Thirst, and cease from their Wanderings. *Plutarch* relates ... that the Feast of Tabernacles was celebrated in Honour of *Bacchus*; nay, that the very Sabbath was consecrated to that Divinity.... *Rutilius* [called] the *Jewish* Sabbaths, Cold Sabbaths, and said their Hearts were colder than their Religion; for this reason, that many of the *Jews* ... did not kindle Fire upon the Sabbath-day.[22]

---

[18] *ibid*, p. 69.

[19] Joseph Schacht, *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, 2nd edition, Oxford Univ. Press, 1959, Preface.

[20] See Ismāʿīl al-ʿUthmānī, *Monthly al-Mishkāt*, Waydah, Morocco, viii, 1419 A.H., pp. 28-9.

[21] Edward Said, *Covering Islam*, Pantheon Books, New York, 1981, p. xvii.

[22] H. Reland, *Four Treatises Concerning the Doctrine, Discipline and Worship of the Mahometans*, London, 1712, pp. 5-6.

them that adherence to their forefathers' religion was futile, they longed to sap all current and future prospects of Muslim political strength.

'Proving' all manner of vice in Muḥammad and all manner of theft from the Scriptures in the Qur᾽ān, Geiger, Tisdall and others helped to cement this scheme. All eyes then turned to the Prophet's *sunna*, and the honor of demolishing this went to Goldziher (1850-1921), the highest ranking Orientalist of his time. In Prof. Humphreys' assessment, his *Muhammedanische Studien* successfully

> demonstrated that a vast number of ḥadīths accepted even in the most rigorously critical Muslim collections were outright forgeries from the late 2nd/8th and 3rd/9th centuries – and as a consequence, that meticulous *isnāds* which supported them were utterly fictitious.[39]

Joseph Schacht pursued his mentor's conclusion further: *isnād* in his view was a remnant of the Abbasid revolution, in the mid second century. The more perfect *isnāds* were the ones most likely to be fake. So highly esteemed was his theory that his *Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence* became an Orientalist bible, beyond refutation or reproach, of which Gibb predicted that it would "become the foundation for all future study of Islamic civilization and law, at least in the West".[40] "We may decide simply that Schacht is right," echoed Humphreys.[41] Critical studies of his work have been systematically neglected,[42] if not barred. When the late Amīn al-Maṣrī chose a critical study of the work as the subject of his Ph.D. thesis, the University of London rejected his application. He fared no better at Cambridge University.[43] Professor N.J. Coulson tried to gently point out some weaknesses in Schacht's thesis, though insisting that in the broad sense it was irrefutable; a short while later he left Oxford University.

Wansbrough, spurred by Schacht's findings, concluded that "with very few exceptions, Muslim jurisprudence was not derived from the contents

of the Qur᾽ān".[44] And so at his hands, the Qur᾽ān's status in early Islamic history was even further marginalized, its eminence within the dealings of the early Muslim community nearly snuffed out. The few remaining cases that could be used as evidence of derivation from the Qur᾽ān were casually dismissed: "It may be added that those few exceptions ... [are] not necessarily proof of the earlier existence of the scriptural source".[45] He provides a reference for this sweeping idea. One wonders what pioneering work has established this blanket statement about the Qur᾽ān, and finds instead: Strack, H., *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*. Which implies that if anything is true of the Talmud and Midrash, it must be even more true of the Qur᾽ān.

ii. The Jewish Question and the Fabrication of a New History

Since 1948 a fresh impetus has been added to the Orientalist cause: the need to secure Israel's boundaries and regional ambitions. To study this new motive requires us to first examine the 'Jewish Question'. The brutality of the Spanish Inquisition, perpetrated by a nation claiming to embrace a God of love, resulted in the peninsula's 'cleansing' from all Muslim presence in addition to the dispersal of Jewry. Of these Jews some took shelter in Turkey, under Ottoman protection, while others settled elsewhere in Europe and bore an uncertain fate. Jews residing in early 19th century Germany for instance were not even legally human: they existed as the king's personal property.

> Like other serfs, Jews could not move from one town to another, marry, or have more than one child without permission. Because of their international connections, however, Jews were officially encouraged to settle in Germany with a view to facilitating trade.[46]

To Germans, the Jewish question manifested itself as the bewilderment of a Christian nation "as to how to treat an entire people who [were unfit] to be free".[47] Of the various theorists who came forth with solutions none exceeded Karl Marx's influence; his scheme for liberating his fellow Jews was to free them from their religious identity, even while lending his support to a petition for Jewish rights.[48] Dennis Fischman writes,

---

faced a veritable tempest of public and journalistic fury following his statement, while his bid to organize a 'religious reformation' was rejected by Turkey's High Court for Islamic Affairs.

[39] R.S. Humphreys, *Islamic History*, p. 83.

[40] H.A.R. Gibb, *Journal of Comparative Legislation and International Law*, 3rd series, vol. 34, parts 3-4 (1951), p. 114.

[41] Humphreys is the King ʿAbdul-ʿAzīz Professor of Islamic Studies at the University of California, Santa Barbara. For this quotation refer to his *Islamic History*, p. 84. See also J. Esposito, *Islam: the Straight Path*, expanded edition, Oxford Univ. Press, New York, 1991, pp. 81-82.

[42] Such as M.M. al-Aʿẓamī, *On Schacht's Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence*, John Wiley, 1985.

[43] See Muṣṭafā as-Sibāʿī, *as-Sunna wa Makānatuhā*, Cairo, 1961, p. 27.

[44] Wansbrough, *Quranic Studies*, p. 44.

[45] *ibid*, p. 44.

[46] Dennis Fischman, *Political Discourse in Exile: Karl Marx and the Jewish Question*, The University of Massachusetts Press, 1991, p. 26.

[47] *ibid*, p. 28.

[48] *ibid*, pp. 7, 15.

In the bleak years of the Second World War, Jews undoubtedly bore their share of the tragedy and suffering which inflamed humanity. In acknowledging their pains the victorious Allies chose to compensate them through the generous bestowment of a 'homeland' on territory which belonged neither to this party nor to that, in the process forcing millions of the land's actual inhabitants to endure a desolate existence in refugee camps for the rest of their lives. By then the efforts to secularize Christianity and Judaism, to convert them into mere symbols of little import in daily life, had made considerable headway. Zionism stood apart from Judaism, the oft-heard sentiment that Jews are entitled to Palestine (based on Yahweh's promise) less a religious conviction than a handy tune for nationalists.[57] But removing God, religion and history from Muslim minds proved to be a steeper challenge: even where secularization did seep in Muslims could not tolerate Israel. Success in this field now meant proving that all references to Jews or to Palestine in Islamic texts were outright forgeries,[58] and to follow the lead of the NT[59] in cleansing the Qur'ān of *all passages which were perceived as anti-Semitic.*

So long as Muslims hold fast to the Qur'ān as Allāh's unalterable Word, this cleansing remains beyond their reach. In this regard Wansbrough set out to prove that the present-day Qur'ān is no longer solely the 'handiwork of Muḥammad', but in fact of many communities scattered throughout the Muslim world which developed the text over the course of two hundred years.[60] Quoting Humphreys:

---

[57] To reiterate the words of Rabbi Hertzberg, the majority of Zionists are secularists who now look to nationalism, and not religion, as their rallying point.

[58] Shortly after Israel's creation, Rev. Prof. Guillaume 'proved' that the *al-Masjid al-Aqṣā* which Muslims seemed so attached to was in fact in a tiny village on the outskirts of Makkah, so very far from Jerusalem! [A. Guillaume, "Where was al-Masyid al-Aqsa", *al-Andalus*, Madrid, 1953, pp. 323-336.]

[59] See *Holy Bible, Contemporary English Version*, American Bible Society, New York, 1995; Joseph Blenkinsopp "The Contemporary English Version: Inaccurate Translation Tries to Soften Anti-Judaic Sentiment," *Bible Review*, vol. xii, no. 5, Oct. 1996, p. 42. In the same issue: Barclay Newman, "CEV's Chief Translator: We Were Faithful to the Intention of the Text," *ibid*, p. 43. The extent of these changes is more far-reaching than these articles imply; see this work pp. 325 - 27.

[60] Norman Calder later joined this bandwagon, showing that the literary works of that period - and not only the Qur'ān - were authored by the Muslim community as a whole. He theorized that the very famous literary works of late 2nd and 3rd century scholars such as *Muwaṭṭa'* of Imām Mālik, *al-Mudawwana* of Saḥnūn, *al-Um* of ash-Shāfi'ī, *al-Kharāj* by Abū Yūsuf and so on, were scholastic texts not authored by any single person [N. Calder, *Studies in Early Muslim Jurisprudence*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1993.]

> Wansbrough hopes to establish two major points:
>
> Islamic scripture – not merely ḥadīth but the Qur'ān itself – was generated in the course of sectarian controversy over a period of more than two centuries, and then fictitiously projected back onto an invented Arabian point of origin.
>
> That Islamic doctrine generally, and even the figure of Muḥammad, were modelled on Rabbinic Jewish prototype.[61]

To this we can append the contemporary work of Yehuda Nevo and J. Koren, who apply their own revisionist approach with the most startling results. Describing archaeological surveys of Jordan and the Arabian Peninsula, they say that although Hellenistic, Nabataean, Roman and Byzantine artifacts have been uncovered, there are no indications of a local Arab culture in the 6th and early 7th centuries C.E.

> In particular, no sixth or seventh-century Jahili pagan sites, and no pagan sanctuaries such as the Muslim sources describe, have been found in the Hijaz [western Arabia] or indeed anywhere in the area surveyed.... Furthermore, *the archaeological work has revealed no trace of Jewish settlement at Medina, Xaybar or Wadi al-Qurra.* Both these points contrast directly with the Muslim literary sources' descriptions of the demographic composition of the pre-Islamic Hijaz.[62]

Koren and Nevo claim that, by contrast, a plethora of evidence for paganism exists in the Central Negev (southern Palestine), an area disregarded by Muslim sources. Excavated shrines indicate that paganism was still practiced there until the outset of the Abbasid reign (mid-eighth century C.E.), meaning that a considerable region of the Negev maintained its pagan identity through the first 150 years of Islam. These shrines, and the surrounding topography, are highly analogous (they allege) to the descriptions of Ḥejāzī pagan sites as quoted by Muslim sources.

> Thus the archaeological evidence indicates that the pagan sanctuaries described in the Muslim sources did not exist in the Jahili Hijaz, but sanctuaries strongly resembling them did exist in the Central Negev until soon after the Abbasids came to power. *This in turn suggests that the accounts of Jahili religion in the Hijaz could well be back-projections of a paganism actually known from later and elsewhere.*[63]

---

[61] R.S. Humphreys, *Islamic History*, p. 84.

[62] J. Koren and Y.D. Nevo, "Methodological Approaches to Islamic Studies", *Der Islam*, Band 68, Heft 1, 1991, p. 101. Emphasis added.

[63] *ibid*, p. 102. Emphasis added.

If we accept Koren and Nevo's assertion, that there is no proof of Jewish settlements in Ḥejāz during the time of the Prophet, the logical result would be the denial of all the verses relating to Jews since they could not possibly have been 'authored' by Muḥammad. The Muslim community must therefore have appended them at a later stage and falsely claimed them as Qur'ān; restoring the Book to its 'original' form (as supposedly penned by Muḥammad) requires the prompt removal of these fraudulent, anti-Semitic passages. And, if we believe that the pre-Islamic paganism cited in the Qur'ān and *sunna* is simply a fictitious back-projection of a culture that flourished in southern Palestine, then by extension the figure of Muḥammad himself becomes questionable. A back-projection perhaps of the ancient remnants of rabbinical presence in Palestine, a fiction modeled on rabbinic prototype, making Koren and Nevo's remarks a perfect fit with Wansbrough's theories. In this way Muslims become indebted to Judaism for providing the fictitious basis of their very identity and historical origin.

Of course, theirs is a grand palace built of thin air and even less in the way of solid evidence. As Nevo insists on non-Muslim sources for verification, so we have surveyed the material evidence of the written word, of Syriac, Georgian, Nestorian, Armenian and Chinese writers, many of them contemporaries of the Prophet's Companions or even of the Prophet himself. We have read the name 'Muḥammad' in their chronicles several times, heard of stunning victories against Persia and Byzantium, observed the Persians in desperate appeal to the Chinese for help, come across the word '*fitna*', seen the names of several caliphs, and heard that the Muslim realms were "the hub of the universe".[64] For those who claim that Islamic history and the figure of Muḥammad are nothing but fiction, what is there left to stand on?

5. Conclusion

Most Muslim countries surrounding Israel have been made to understand the urgency of changing their school curriculums, to uproot any point which arouses passions that Jews may find distasteful.[65] But the Qur'ān remains an obstacle: a Book that frequently cites Jewish intransigence and disobedience, and whose verses wet the lips of schoolchildren, of congregations in mosques, of the penitent Muslim at night with his Muṣḥaf, whose cadence echoes in

almost every aspect of life. Realizing what motives drive the present research on the Qur'ān is vital, that the products of such research may not catch the reader unawares.

Strugnell and Delitzsch's research on Jewish themes is now rejected because of allegations of anti-Semitism. The Israel Antiquities Department judges qualifications based on its vision of ideological compatibility. Yet every Christian, Jew or atheist who engages in willful lies to undermine the precepts, elegance, history or future prospects of Islam is allowed to consider himself a *sheikh*, to believe that Muslims are beholden to his objectivity and obliged to accept his findings. This is indefensible. Why are the academic dismissals unleashed against those accused of anti-Semitism,[66] not applicable to those who distort Islam for ulterior gains? Why should non-Muslims be deemed authorities to the exclusion of practicing Muslims? Why should men of the Church—Mingana, Guillaume, Watt, Anderson, Lammanse, and a horde of others who wish nothing more heartily than to see their religion eclipse Islam—be regarded as the standard in 'unbiased' Islamic research? Why should Muir be considered an authority on the Prophet's life, when he writes that the Qur'ān is among "the most stubborn enemies of Civilisation, Liberty, and the Truth which the World has yet known"?[67]

---

[64] See pp. 39 - 41 and p. 206 footnote 8.

[65] As a case in point – based on my information from Jordan – Israel has asked some of its neighboring Arab countries (as part of the peace process package) to eliminate all curriculum references to the Crusades, Ṣalaḥuddīn al-Ayyūbī (Saladdin), and his re-conquering of Jerusalem.

[66] The term 'anti-Semite' itself is a conscious misrepresentation for anti-Judaic, since the overwhelming majority of Semites for the past fourteen centuries have been Muslims.

[67] As quoted in M. Broomhall, *Islam in China*, New Impression, London, 1987, p. 2.

CHAPTER TWENTY ONE

EPILOGUE

Anyone writing about Islam must initially decide whether or not he believes in Muḥammad as a prophet. Scholars who acknowledge him as a genuine messenger, the noblest of all prophets, enjoy an incredible library of *ḥadīths* and divine revelations from which to draw their inspiration. By necessity they will share innumerable similarities, even total agreement on fundamental issues; whatever minor variations arise due to shifting circumstances are entirely natural and human. Those refusing this viewpoint however, must by extension see Muḥammad as a fictitious figure, a deluded man possessed of some illness, or simply a liar bearing false claims of prophethood. At best an enigma, too powerful and unnerving for our political realities. Such is the inescapable stance that every non-Muslim writer must take, through which his or her efforts are filtered. If there was no veiled motive, no yearning to puncture the image of Muḥammad as a messenger, or of the Qur'ān as the Word of the Creator, or of Islam as divinely ordained, what would compel this person to sit down and write?

Orientalist research transcends mere subjectivity to manifest itself as anti-Islamic dogma. Its view is born in regal ancestry: intense rivalry of religions, centuries of crusades, the colonization of Muslim lands, and a colonial pride that blossomed into contempt for the customs, beliefs and the very history of Muslims. To this we add the more recent motives: encouraging secularism to promote global Jewish inclusion and ensure Israel's territorial integrity. And along these ancestral lines their efforts will continue, attacking the Qur'ān just as their forefathers sought other means to dominate the 'Muhammadans', as though Muslims were prostrating before a golden idol of that name.

The maxim of Ibn Sīrīn (*d.* 110 A.H.) holds greater urgency today than ever before:

> This knowledge [of religion] constitutes faith, so be wary of whom you acquire your knowledge from.[1]

This means that on Islamic issues—whether the Qur'ān, *tafsīr*, *ḥadīth*, *fiqh*, history *etc.* —only the writings of a practicing Muslim are worthy of our attention. These may then be accepted or rejected according to their merits.[2] But as to individuals who clearly hail from outside the community, their motives concealed behind a slender façade of sincerity, we can only meet them with rejection. Neither can we make them *sheikhs* of Islam,[3] nor can we accept their claims to that title.

---

[1] Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, i:14.

In news coverage of former President Clinton's impeachment trial a few years ago, I cannot once recall a film reviewer or food critic being asked for his or her *legal* opinion on this case, even though copies of the United States Constitution are available for all to read. Legal discussions were rightfully limited to lawyers and professors of constitutional law. Nor did professors of law from elsewhere participate, since this was an internal predicament for the United States. This is sadly far from how Islam is treated. Can a sports commentator, having read the Constitution on the internet and listened to lawyers during news coverage, expect his legal opinion to carry scholarly weight? No, but people from outside relevant academic circles, such as Toby Lester, voice their opinions in articles which then gain scholarly status. Does the German professor of law have the clout to appear on television and instruct the American people on how to run *their* judicial system? No, but Western scholars feel impelled to instruct Muslims as to how they must interpret their own religion.

Allāh remains supreme whether we live in the first, twenty-first or the last century, and whoever seeks to dethrone Him, however self-assuredly, burns only himself without touching a single fiber of His Glory. No one can be forced to believe in the Qur'ān's sanctity; people must settle on their own paths as they alone will bear the future consequences of their deeds. But here, in this life, no outsider addressing Muslims and passing judgment on their faith and scholarship should find his words falling on attentive

---

[2] Even non-Muslims seeking to learn about Islam should begin by reading the Muslim literature. When university students wish to study socialism for instance, they always start with the essential manifestos to comprehend the general subject before, perhaps, moving on to critiques of socialist theory. The same scheme applies to biblical studies. So for students of Islamic studies to begin and end their field of knowledge with Orientalist writings, to almost completely ignore the traditional Muslim sources and simply listen to what Western revisionism claims, is wholly absurd.

[3] Back in the early 1990s while teaching at Princeton University, an incident led me to rediscover the importance of Ibn Sīrīn's statement. The head of the Dept. of Religious Studies, Prof. L. Udovich, a Jewish scholar well-versed in Arabic and Islamic Jurisprudence (and a colleague with whom I was on good terms), told me jokingly, "I know Arabic and *fiqh* so I am a *sheikh*". This disturbed me considerably; I did not know how to get out of such a possible scenario of non-Muslims delivering *fatwās* (legal opinions) in the future. After a few days' search I stumbled upon this golden rule, and have gratefully remembered it since.

ears. If such is not the case today then Muslims must take their fair share of the blame.

We live in difficult times, and difficult times may well lie ahead; Allāh knows best. One or two decades ago the notion of Western scholars forcing Muslims to excise all Qur'ānic references to Jews might have appeared far-fetched to some, but now the realities of our era blanket us with the vigor of a hailstorm. What the scholars did theoretically, their governments are now pursuing politically, and their efforts take tangible shape all around us. Western intervention in the Islamic curriculum; forced auditing and closures; directives which openly call for purging the Qur'ān of all references to *jihād* or anything critical of Christians and Jews; vague personalities with Arabic-sounding surnames (whose names I will not mention as they deserve no publicity), claiming things about Islam which no Muslim has claimed before; 'terrorism experts' who appear on international newsfeeds to pronounce their judgments on Muslim texts; secularist governments seen as the ideal worth aspiring to, while more conservative ones loom as an impending threat. On all levels, the Qur'ān is under assault as never before.

What lies ahead is a mystery kept with Allāh, but the least we must do is to understand the principles of our religion and the essentials which do not vary with time. Among these must be our reverence for the Qur'ān. Any piece of text which differs from the Muṣḥaf in our hands, regardless of what it claims to be, is not and can *never* be part of the Qur'ān. Likewise, any attempt by non-Muslims to dictate to us the precepts and legitimacy of our own religion must be dismissed outright. Whatever the political climate, Muslim views on the Holy Book must remain firm: it is the Word of Allāh, constant, immaculate, unalterable and inimitable.

> عن تميم الداري، قال: سمعت رسول الله ﷺ يقول: ليبلغن هذا الأمر ما بلغ الليل
> والنهار، ولا يترك الله بيت مدر، ولا وبر، إلا أدخله الله هذا الدين، بعزّ عزيز أو بذلّ
> ذليل. يعزّ الله عز وجل به الإسلام، وذلا يذلّ الله به الكفر.[4]

> Tamīm ad-Dārī relates, "I heard the Prophet say, '[This religion] will reach the expanses of the day and night, and Allāh will not leave off any house of mud nor wool [*i.e.* in the city or countryside] till He has introduced this religion into it, either through the glory of the honorable or the ignobility of the dishonorable. Such is the honor that Allāh will bestow on Islam, and the debasement that He will cast on disbelief".

---

[4] Ibn Ḥanbal, *Musnad*, iv:103, *ḥadīth* no. 16998.

﴿ يُرِيدُونَ أَن يُطْفِـُٔوا۟ نُورَ ٱللَّهِ بِأَفْوَٰهِهِمْ وَيَأْبَى ٱللَّهُ إِلَّآ أَن يُتِمَّ نُورَهُۥ وَلَوْ
كَرِهَ ٱلْكَـٰفِرُونَ ۝٣٢ هُوَ ٱلَّذِىٓ أَرْسَلَ رَسُولَهُۥ بِٱلْهُدَىٰ وَدِينِ ٱلْحَقِّ
لِيُظْهِرَهُۥ عَلَى ٱلدِّينِ كُلِّهِۦ وَلَوْ كَرِهَ ٱلْمُشْرِكُونَ ۝٣٣ ﴾[5]

"They seek to extinguish the [guiding] radiance of Allāh with their mouths, and Allāh refuses but to complete His radiance regardless of how abhorrent that is to those who disbelieve. It is He Who sent forth His messenger with guidance and the religion of truth, that He may elevate it above all false beliefs, however abhorrent that is to those who ascribe partners to Him."

---

[5] Qurʾān 9:32-33.

GLOSSARY TERMS

Abrogation	Replacement of an earlier legalistic verse with a chronologically successive one. The latter supplants the rulings inherent in the former and, in certain cases, removes the former's wording from the Qurʾān as well.
Alif	The first letter of the Arabic alphabet and the first of three vowels. Although Arabic is by and large written phonetically, *alif* is an exception and the patterns for its usage are irregular at times.
Autographed copy	The first or original manuscript of a work, not that of a subsequent pupil or copyist.
Anṣār	Lit. "supporters", the Muslims of Madinah who, pledging allegiance to the Prophet, joined the Muslim immigrants from Makkah in establishing the first Islamic state.
A.H.	Anno Hegirae (in the year of the Hijra). In reference to the Prophet's journey from Makkah to Madinah in the month of Rabīʿ al-Awwal, 1 A.H., which heralded the beginning of the first Muslim state and, hence, of the Muslim calendar.
Adhān	The initial call to each of the five daily prayers, proclaimed by the muʾadhdhin.
ʿAdl	"Of righteous conduct." Characterized by as-Suyūṭī as a mentally sound Muslim who has reached maturity, is free from the causes of indecency, and who observes the norms and standards of his community.
Allāh	The One God, the Everlasting. He has always been, has no progeny, and in His image nothing has been created.
Āyah	A verse of the Qurʾān; can also be used more generally to mean any of Allāh's signs in the created universe.

Apostasy	The desertion of one's religious faith.
Black Stone	A stone sent down from Paradise which the Prophet Ibrāhīm was directed to place in a corner of the Kaʿba. An object of deep reverence, the Black Stone remains in the Kaʿba to this day.
B.C.E.	Before Common Era, a customary substitute for B.C. (Before Christ).
C.E.	Common Era, a customary substitute for A.D. (Anno Domini, Year of the Lord). The modern Gregorian calendar was founded by Pope Gregory XIII in 1582; all dates prior to this are back projections.
Caliph	The title taken by the Prophet's successors as both heads of government and of religious affairs.
Collation	Critical comparison of texts or data, with a view to consolidating and noting similarities and differences.
Codex	A manuscript volume, especially of a religious or classic text.
Comma Johanneum	A Trinitarian statement in 1 John 5:7, introduced into the printed Greek NT in the 16th century (and thereafter into the *King James Version*, 1611), now recognized as spurious.
Companion	Any Muslim who was a contemporary of the Prophet Muḥammad, having seen or heard him at least once while professing the faith. The hypocrites of Madinah, and any who subsequently rejected Islam and died as apostates, are excluded from this definition.
Canon	A list of religious texts officially recognized by members of that religion as authoritative.
Consonantal text	One that is devoid of vowels.
Creed	A statement of religious belief, a declaration of faith.
Cuneiform	Designating the wedge-shaped characters used in ancient Sumerian, Akkadian, Assyrian, Babylonian and Persian inscriptions.
Dead Sea Scrolls	Manuscripts found at Qumran and Wadī Murabbaʿāt near the Dead Sea, including fragmented scrolls of the Old Testament, other Jewish texts, and some Arabic fragments.
Diacritical dots/marks	Also known as *tashkīl* or *nuqaṭ al-iʿrāb*. A means of designating the inflection of letters within words, usually through the addition of supplementary symbols.
"Equal status"	In the context of this work, ensuring that the various manuscripts one compares against each other are of equal analytic value.
Estrangelo	See Syriac.
Exegesis	Explanatory or interpretive effort usually focused on a religious text.
Extant	Available, not lost. Usually in reference to ancient manuscripts.
Exodus	Moses, Aaron and the Israelites' escape from Pharaonic Egypt. Also the second book of the Old Testament, describing this.
Exile (Babylonian)	The period beginning with Nebuchadnezzar's conquest of Jerusalem and the Judean expulsion to Babylonia, and concluding with Cyrus' defeat of Babylonia and his decree permitting captive peoples to return to their lands (586-538 B.C.E.).
Fasiq	A dissolute individual who flaunts his transgressions.
Fatwā	A legal opinion issued by a jurist.
Fiqh	The corpus of Islamic jurisprudence, the science of implementing Islamic law.
Fitna	Anything with the capacity to test or rattle a Muslim's faith and behavior. Historically is also applied to the dissensions and tribulations experienced in early Islam, first of which was the assassination of Caliph ʿUthmān in 35 A.H.
Fluid text	One that remains exposed to revisions, additions and deletions. Opposite of a fixed text.
Ghazwa	(Pl., Ghazawāt.) A military expedition, though it also refers to expending energy for the spread of the faith.
Gospels	The first four books of the New Testament, composed anonymously, each of which presents an account of Jesus.

Ḥadīth	A report communicating a saying or deed of the Prophet Muḥammad, as witnessed by his Companions who transmitted the details in turn to their pupils.
Ḥajj	Pilgrimage to Makkah, the fifth of Islam's five pillars and a one-time obligation upon every believer who is physically and financially able to undertake it.
Ḥuffāẓ	(Sing., Ḥāfiẓ.) Muslims who have memorized the entire Qurʾān by heart.
Ḥejāzī script	A back-slanting script which was the initial favorite for transcribing the Qurʾān in the first century A.H.
Hijra	The migration, from Makkah to Madinah, of the Companions in general and of the Prophet specifically, signaling the birth of the first Muslim state (1 A.H./622 C.E.).
Hypocrites	During the Prophet's residence in Madinah, a small sector of its residents who opposed him semi-secretly and who endeavored on repeated occasions to undermine or betray him.
ʿIlm	Knowledge in general; in Islamic studies it represents the religious sciences such as *ḥadīth*, fiqh and tafsīr.
Imām	One who leads the congregation in prayer, or any religious instructor.
Islam	The name of the religion expounded in the Qurʾān, it denotes submission to the One God.
Isnād	A chain of narrators relaying any given report, whether history or jurist rulings or folklore, though usually associated with *ḥadīth*. Assessing the accuracy and trustworthiness of each link in the chain provides a basis for the report's authenticity, without which the report is discarded.
Iqāma	The second call to each of the five daily prayers, held just prior to the commencement of prayer.
al-Jarḥ wa at-Taʿdīl	The science of narrators, a colossal biographical library to aid the *muḥaddithīn* in ranking the transmitters of *ḥadīth* according to their reliability and truthfulness or lack thereof.

Jihād	To exert one's efforts in the cause of Allāh. Though it often alludes to the field of battle, it can also signify other endeavors that may or may not be battle-related (*e.g.* helping to finance a military campaign, striving for justice, fending off one's own inappropriate whims and wants).
Jinn	Spirit creatures born of fire; can be virtuous or malevolent.
Juzʾ	One thirtieth part of the Qurʾān. These demarcations allow those who seek to recite the whole in one month to pace themselves accordingly.
Kaʿba	Lit. "cube". The Great Sanctuary built in Makkah by the prophets Ibrāhīm and Ismāʿīl.
Karaite movement	A Jewish sect founded in the 8th century C.E., which rejected the rabbinical teachings of the Talmud and recognized only the Bible as the source of religious authority.
Kūfic script	One of a number of angular scripts which rose to prominence and supplanted the Ḥejāzī as the predominant script for the Holy Qurʾān. 'Kūfic' has now become an umbrella term under which several angular scripts are catalogued.
Law of witness	The Qurʾānic injunction, from verse 2:282, stipulating two male (or one male and two female) witnesses for transactions.
Manāzil	Demarcation of the Muṣḥaf into seven equal parts, to assist those seeking to finish the entire Book in a week's time.
Masoretic text	The Hebrew text of the Old Testament after the incorporation of vowel signs and accent marks in early medieval times, devised to shield it from further changes.
Minuscule script	A cursive script using lower case Greek letters that came to prominence in the 9th century C.E.
Mishna	The Jewish Oral Law, housing the explanations necessary for application of the Written Law. Probably dates from the time when the latter was first promulgated to the people, though the current redaction is mostly the work of Rabbi Judah ha-Nasi, *c.* 200 C.E.

Muʿāraḍa	The phrase used in *ḥadīths* for the annual recitations between the Prophet and the Archangel Jibrīl, with one initially reciting while the other listened, then vice versa.
Mufaṣṣal	The segment from *Sūra Qāf* till the end of the Qur᾿ān.
Muḥaddithīn	The traditional scholars of *ḥadīth*.
Muhājirīn	Lit. "immigrants". The Makkan Muslims who migrated to Madinah, having been the first to champion the Prophet's cause.
Multiple readings	The presence of more than one wording, wherein there is no uncertainty and each one is recognized as correct.
Muṣḥaf	(Pl., Maṣāḥif.) Denotes a written copy of the Qur'an, which may be whole or partial (containing select *sūras* only).
Nestorian	A follower of Nestorius, patriarch of Constantinople (428-431 C.E.), who contended that the divine and the human existed as two distinct natures in Jesus. His doctrine was declared heretical by the Church in 431 C.E.
New Testament	The portion of the Bible that focuses on Jesus and his followers, including the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles and the Revelation of Saint John.
Old Testament	Christian designation for the Jewish Scriptures.
Orientalism	In general terms, the study of the East. It is, to quote Edward Said, "a way of coming to terms with the Orient that is based on the Orient's special place in European Western experience" [*Orientalism*, p. 1].
Orthography	The study of spelling conventions.
Palimpsest	A parchment or tablet that has been written upon more than once; the previous text, imperfectly erased, remains partly visible.
"People of the Book"	Those hailing from a monotheistic tradition who were given Scriptures, the Jews and Christians.
Paleography	The description or deciphering of ancient writings. The term is used, in the context of this work, to signify the study of a language's script (such as the shape of its letters and the usage of dots).
Pointing	Diacritical marks for indicating the pronunciation and intonation of a text.
Qāri᾿	(Pl., Qurrā᾿.) A professional reciter of the Qur᾿ān.
Qirā᾿at	The science of proper Qur᾿ānic recitation; any reading must be traceable to the Prophet if it is to be authoritative.
Q (Gospel of Jesus)	The work originally composed by Jesus' earliest followers.
Qur᾿ān	The Holy Book and the most sacred text of Islam, containing the revelations that were communicated by Allāh, through Archangel Jibrīl, to the Prophet Muḥammad.
Rakʿa	(Pl., Rakʿāt.) A unit of prayer (ṣalāt). Each of the daily prayers is composed of a predetermined number of rakʿāt.
Ramaḍān	The ninth month of the Muslim calendar, the fasting of which (from dawn to dusk) constitutes Islam's fourth pillar.
Reading Certificate	In the course of transmitting *ḥadīth* (or other Islamic) manuscripts, this was a record supplying precise details of attendance and comprising an exclusive license for those listed within to read, teach, copy or quote from that book.
Recension	Textual revision based on a critical assessment of the sources at hand.
Revisionism	A school of thought that rejects the traditional and favors revising accepted theories and doctrines *etc.*
Riḥla	A journey; in the context of Islamic studies, traveling in pursuit of religious knowledge.
Ṣaḥīḥ	A rigorously authentic *ḥadīth* or a collection thereof.
Sajdah	Prostration, such as those performed in the course of regular prayers or after reciting certain verses of the Qur᾿ān.
Semite	Any of the various peoples, ancient and modern, originating from southwest Asia and employing the Semitic

	family of languages, including Phoenician, Aramaic, Hebrew, Arabic and several others.
Septuagint	Also called "The Version of the Seventy" or LXX. A third century B.C.E. translation of the Old Testament into Greek, used both by Jews living in the Greek diaspora and by the early Christian community.
Seven dialects (*aḥruf*)	A divine sanctioning of the Qur'an in more than one dialect. This served as both an aid to Arab tribes that were unaccustomed to the Quraishi vernacular, and a way of illuminating various shades of meaning within particular verses.
Scribal error	An inadvertent divergence from the template being copied, by a scribe suffering from fatigue, faulty eyesight, sheer carelessness or other such factors.
Sharīʿa	Islamic law.
Skeletal dots	Dots appended to letters which otherwise share the same skeleton, to differentiate between them. Also known as *nuqaṭ al-iʿjām*.
Successors	The Muslim generation immediately following the Companions. They in turn were followed by the Succeeding Successors.
Ṣuḥuf	Lit. "sheets". Refers to the master volume of the Qurʾān that was prepared, on the basis of first-hand Qurʾānic fragments, during the reign of Caliph Abū Bakr.
Sunna	The way of the Prophet Muḥammad. This, along with the Qurʾān, comprises the source of Islamic legislation and jurisprudence.
Sūra	A chapter of the Qurʾān, of which there are 114 of variable length. Each sūra is an independent unit, with no chronology or narrative passing over from one to the next.
Syriac	A dialect of Aramaic that was current in Syria from the 3rd century C.E. to the 13th.
Tafsīr	An exegesis (explanation or interpretation) of the Holy Qurʾān.
Talmud	Held by Orthodox Judaism to be the highest authority on all matters of faith, the Talmud is divided into the Mishna (Oral Law) and the Gemara (an expansion of the Mishna by means of commentary and explanation).
Tashahhud	Declaration of faith (bearing witness that there is no god but Allāh and that Muḥammad is His messenger) during the course of prayers (ṣalāt).
Ten Commandments	The ten injunctions given by God to Moses on Mount Sinai, constituting the fundamental moral code of Judaism. Also known as the Decalogue; see Exodus 20, Deuteronomy 5.
Text type	A version of a known text, emanating from a particular time or place and bearing deviations which become representative of, and associated with, that version.
Tiberian System	Inspired by Arabic diacritical marks, this was an analogous system devised by the Masoretes of Tiberias to represent the intonations of the Hebrew Biblical text.
Thiqa	"Trustworthy." An indispensable trait that must apply to all transmitters of a *ḥadīth*, if their report is to be regarded as genuine.
Torah	Jewish Law, though also used more generally to mean the Pentateuch (the first five books of the OT), the entire Old Testament or even all Jewish religious literature.
Traditionalism	The school of thought which largely adheres to, and works within the framework of, accepted theories and doctrines.
Tribe	The cornerstone of societal organization in Arabia in the pre- and early Islamic eras.
Trinity	The Christian doctrine of God as three Entities (Father, Son and Holy Spirit) in one.
Uncial script	The formal book hand used for Greek manuscripts until its deterioration in the 9th century C.E., consisting entirely of capital letters and penned without the benefit of separation between words.
Umma	A nation or people, especially the Muslim community as a whole.

ʿUthmān's Muṣḥaf	Refers not only to the Qurʾānic compilation authorized by the third caliph, but also to its spelling conventions. Any writing which deviates from the consonantal text of ʿUthmān's Muṣḥaf cannot be regarded as Qurʾān.
Variant readings	The presence of more than one wording, clouded by uncertainty as to which is correct.
Vulgate	A Latin translation of the Bible prepared by St. Jerome at the close of the 4th century C.E., which ultimately served as the authorized version of the Roman Catholic Church.
Waḥy	Revelation, specifically the words and thoughts bestowed by Allāh upon His Prophet.
Yahweh	The Hebrew name for God in the Old Testament.
Zakāt	Obligatory almsgiving, assessed on the basis of one's wealth. The third pillar of Islam.
Zamzam	The holy water which first sprang at the infant Ismāʿīl's feet, in the barren valley which is now Makkah. It flows to this day.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A/Ā

Abbott, N.: *The Rise of the North Arabic Script and its Kurʾānic Development, with a full Description of the Kurʾān Manuscripts in the Oriental Institute* (Chicago, 1938).

al-ʿĀbidī, Maḥmūd: *Makhṭūṭāt al-Baḥr al-Mayyit* (ʿAmmān, 1967).

Abū Dāwūd: *Sunan*, ed. M.M. ʿAbdūl-Ḥamīd, 4 vols. (2nd imp. Cairo 1369/1950). English translation by Ahmad Hasan: *Sunan Abu Dawud*, 3 vols. (Lahore, 1984).

Abū Khaithama, Zuhair b. Ḥarb: *Kitāb al-ʿIlm*, ed. N.A. al-Albānī (Damascus, no date).

Abū Laylā, M.:"The Qurʾan: Nature, Authenticity, Authority and Influence on the Muslim Mind", *The Islamic Quarterly* 36/4 (4th Quarter 1992), pp. 227-241.

Abū ʿUbaid, Qāsim b. Sallām: *Faḍāʾil al-Qurʾān*, ed. M. al-ʿAtiyya *et al* (Damascus, 1415/1995).

Abū ʿUbaidah, Maʿmar b. al-Muthannā: *Majāz al-Qurʾān*, ed. F. Sezgin, 2 vols. (Cairo, no date [*c.* 1374/1954]).

Aḥmad, A. ʿAbdur-Razzāq: "Nashʾat al-Khaṭ al-ʿArabī wa Taṭawwurahu ʿAlā al-Maṣāḥif", in *Maṣāḥif Ṣanʿāʾ* (Dar al-Athar al-Islamiyyah, Kuwait, 1405/1985), pp. 31-39 (Arabic section).

Aksiyon (Turkish weekly, 22-28 Haziran 1996).

al-Akwaʿ, al-Qāḍī Ismāʿīl: "The Mosque of Sanʿāʾ: A Leading Islamic Monument in Yemen", in Op. cit., pp. 9-23 (Arabic section).

Album, S.: *A Checklist of Islamic Coins* (2nd ed. Santa Rosa, 1998).

ʿAlī, Jawād: *al-Mufaṣṣal fī Tārīkh al-ʿArab Qabl al-Islām*, 10 vols. (Beirut, 1968).

Ali, M. Mohar: *Sīrat an-Nabī and the Orientalists*, 2 vols. (Madinah, 1417/1997).

ʿAlī, ʿA. Yūsuf (trans), see *al-Qurʾān al-Karīm*.

Altikulaç, T.: *Al-Muṣḥaf Al-Sharīf Attributed to ʿUthmān bin ʿAffān (The copy at the Topkapi Palace Museum)* (Istanbul, 2007).

_____: *Hz. Osman'a Nisbet Edilen Mushaf-I Serîf (Türk ve Islâm Eserleri Müzesi Nüshasi)* (Istanbul, 1428/2007).

Anderson, G.A.: "Torah Before Sinai – The Do's and Don'ts Before the Ten Commandments", *Bible Review* 12/3 (Jun 1996), pp. 38-44.

"Arts of the Islamic World", *Sotheby's* (London, 2008).

Asad, Muḥammad (trans), see *al-Qur'ān al-Karīm.*

al-Aṣfahānī, Abū al-Faraj: *al-Aghānī* (Cairo, 1345/1927).

Ashraf, Muhammad: *A Catalogue of Arabic Manuscripts in Salar Jung Museum & Library* (Hyderabad, *c.* 1962).

al-ʿAskar, M.: *Shuhadā' Yaum al-Yamāmah (12/633),* (Riyāḍ, 1427/2006).

ʿAwwād, K.: *Aqdam al-Makhṭūṭāt al-ʿArabiyya fī Maktabāt al-ʿĀlam* (Baghdad, 1982).

al-Aʿẓamī, M.M.: *Kuttāb an-Nabī* (3rd ed. Riyāḍ, 1401/1981).

____: *Manhajin Naqd ʿInd al-Muḥaddithīn* (3rd ed. Riyāḍ, 1410/1990).

____: "Nash'at al-Kitāba al-Fiqhiyya", *Dirāsāt* 2/2 (1398/1978), pp. 13-24.

____: *Studies in Early Ḥadīth Literature: with a Critical Edition of some Early Texts* (2nd ed. Indianapolis, 1978 [under the name M.M. Azami]).

____: *Studies in Ḥadīth Methodology and Literature* (Indianapolis, 1977 [under M.M. Azami]).

____: *On Schacht's Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence* (New York/Riyāḍ, 1985).

al-ʿAzzah, ʿA.: *Naqsh Ḥalḥūl 55/674: Aqdam Naqsh fī Filasṭīn* (Kaft Kanna, 1990).

B

Badcock, F.J.: *The History of the Creeds* (2nd ed. London, 1938).

al-Baghdādī = al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī.

Baig, Khalid: "The Millennium Bug", *Impact International* 30/1 (Jan 2000), p. 5.

al-Baihaqī: *as-Sunan al-Kubrā,* 10 vols. (Hyderabad, 1344-1355).

al-Balādhurī, Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā: *Ansāb al-Ashrāf,* ed. M. Hamidullah (Cairo, 1959).

al-Bāqillanī: *al-Intiṣār li'l-Qur'ān* (Frankfurt, 1986 [facsimile edition]). Abridged by A. Ṣābūnī: *Nukat al-Intiṣār Linaql al-Qur'ān,* ed. M. Salām (Alexandria, no date).

Beck, A.B.: "Introduction to the Leningrad Codex", in *The Leningrad Codex: A Facsimile Edition* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge, 1998), pp. ix-xx.

Behn, W.H.: *Index Islamicus: 1665-1905* (Millersville, 1989).

Bell, H.I.: "The Arabic Bilingual Entagion", *Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc.* 89/3 (Oct 1945), pp. 531-42.

Bellamy, J.A.: "Arabic Verses from the First/Second Century: The Inscription of ʿEn ʿAvdat", *J. Semitic Studies* 35/1 (1990), pp. 73-79.

____: "Fa-Ummuhu Hawiyah: A Note on Surah 101:9", *JAOS* 112 (1992), pp. 485-87.

____: "A New Reading of the Namārah Inscription", *JAOS* 105/1 (1985), pp. 31-51.

____: "Two Pre-Islamic Arabic Inscriptions Revised: Jabal Ramm and Umm Al-Jimāl", *JAOS* 108/3 (1988), pp. 369-72.

____: "Al-Raqim or al-Ruqud? A Note on Surah 18:9", *JAOS* 111(1991), pp. 115-17.

____: "Some Proposed Emendations to the Text of the Koran", *JAOS* 113 (1993), pp. 562-73.

____: "More Proposed Emendations to the Text of the Koran", *JAOS* 116 (1996), pp. 196-204.

Bergsträsser, G.: "Plan eines Apparatus Criticus zum Koran", *Sitzungsberichte Bayer. Akad.* 7 (München, 1930).

____: *Usūl Naqd an-Nuṣūṣ wa Nashr al-Kutub* (Cairo, 1969).

Bible: *Contemporary English Version* (New York, 1995).

____: *Holy Bible from the Ancient Eastern Text: George M. Lamsa's Translation from the Aramaic of the Peshitta* (San Francisco, no date [*c.* 1996]).

____: *King James Version* (Grand Rapids, 1983).

____: *The New Testament 1526 Translated by William Tyndale (Original Spelling Edition),* ed. W.R. Cooper (London, 2000).

____: *New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures* (New York, 1984).

____: *Revised Standard Version* (New York, 1952).

Blachère, R.: *Introduction au Coran* (Paris, 1947).

____/J. Sauvaget, *Règles pour editions et traductions de textes arabes* (1953). Arabic translation by M. al-Miqdād: *Qawāʿid Taḥqīq al-Makhṭūṭāt al-ʿArabiyya wa Tarjamatuhā* (Beirut/Damascus, 1409/1988).

Blenkinsopp, J.: "The Contemporary English Version: Inaccurate Translation Tries to Soften Anti-Judaic Sentiment", *Bible Review* 12/5 (Oct 1996), pp. 42, 51.

Bobzin, H.: "A Treasury of Heresies", in S. Wild (ed.): *The Qur'an as Text* (Leiden, 1996), pp. 157-175.

Bright, J.: *The Authority of the Old Testament* (Nashville, 1967).

Broomhall, M.: *Islam in China* (London, 1987 [reprint of 1910 edition]).

Bucaille, M.: *The Bible, The Qur'ān and Science* (Indianapolis, 1978).

____: *Moses and Pharaoh: The Hebrews in Egypt* (Tokyo, 1994).

al-Bukhārī, Muḥammad b. Ismāʿīl: *Khalq Afʿāl al-ʿIbād* (Makkah, 1390/1970).

____: *Kitāb aḍ-Ḍuʿafā' aṣ-Ṣagīr* (Ḥaleb, 1396/1976).

____: *Ṣaḥīḥ with the Commentary of Ibn Ḥajar,* ed. F. ʿAbdul-Bāqī, 13 vols. (al-Maṭbaʿah as-Salafīyya, Cairo, 1380 [all the ḥadīth serial no's from this edition]). English translation by M. Muḥsin Khān: *The Translation of the Meanings of Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī,* 8 vols. (2nd revised ed. Pakistan, 1973).

Bunimovitz, S.: "How Mute Stones Speak: Interpreting What We Dig Up", *Biblical Archaeology Review* 21/2 (Mar/Apr 1995), pp. 58-67, 96-100.

Burton, J.: *The Collection of the Qur'ān* (Cambridge, 1977).

____: *An Introduction to the Hadith* (Edinburgh, 1994).

C

Calder, N.: *Studies in Early Muslim Jurisprudence* (Oxford, 1993).

Cantineau, J.: *Le Nabatéen* (Osnabrück, 1978 [reprint of 1930 edition]).

Comay, J./R. Brownrigg: *Who's Who in the Bible: The Old Testament and the Apocrypha and the New Testament,* 2 vols. in 1 (New York, 1980).

Comfort, P.W.: *Early Manuscripts & Modern Translations of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, 1990).

Cook, M.: *The Koran: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford, 2000).

D

Ḍaif, Shauqī (ed.): *Kitāb as-Sab'a*, see Ibn Mujāhid.

Damon, P.E. *et al*: "Radiocarbon Dating of the Shroud of Turin", *Nature* 337 (Feb 1989), pp. 611-15.

Danby, H. (trans): *The Mishnah* (Oxford, 1933).

ad-Dānī, Abū ʿAmr: *al-Muḥkam fī Naqṭ al-Maṣāḥif*, ed. ʿI. Ḥasan (Damascus, 1379/1960).

_____: *al-Muqniʿ*, ed. M.S. Qamḥāwī (Cairo, no date).

_____: *Kitāb an-Naqṭ*, ed. M.S. Qamḥāwī (Cairo, no date).

ad-Dārimī: *Sunan*, ed. Dahmān, 2 vols. (Damascus, 1349).

David-Weill, J. (ed.): *Le D̲jâmiʿ d'Ibn Wahb*, see Ibn Wahb.

Davidson, B.: *Syriac Reading Lessons* (London, 1851).

Demsky, A.: "Who Returned First: Ezra or Nehemiah", *Bible Review* 12/2 (Apr 1996), pp. 28-33, 46, 48.

Déroche, F.: "Manuscripts of the Qurʾān", in J.D. McAuliffe (ed.): *Encyclopaedia of the Qurʾān*, vol. 3 (Leiden, 2003), pp. 254-75.

_____: "Note sur les fragments coraniques anciens de Katta Langar (Ouzbékistan)", *Cahiers d'Asie Centrale* 7 (1999), pp. 65-73.

_____: "The Qurʾan of Amagur", *Manuscripts of the Middle East* 5 (1990-91), pp. XXX.

_____/S.N. Noseda: *Sources de la transmission manuscrite du texte Coranique, Les manuscrits de style higazi, Volume 1. Le manuscrit arabe 328(a) de la Bibliotheque nationale de France* (Lesa, 1998).

_____/ S.N. Noseda: *Sources de la transmission manuscrite du texte Coranique, Les manuscrits de style higazi, Volume 2, tome 1. Le manuscrit Or. 2165 (f. 1 à 61) de la British Library* (Lesa, 2001).

adh-Dhahabī, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad: *al-Mūqiẓa*, ed. A. Abū Ghudda (Beirut, 1412).

_____: *Seyar al-Aʿlām an-Nubalāʾ*, ed. A. Shuʿaib, 25 vols. (Beirut, 1401/1981).

_____: *Ṭabaqāt al-Qurrāʾ*, ed. A. Khān, 3 vols. (Riyāḍ, 1418/1997).

_____: *Tadhkirat al-Ḥuffāẓ*, 2 vols. (3rd ed., Hyderabad, 1375/1975).

Dilling, E.: *The Plot Against Christianity* (Chicago, no date).

"Discovery of Egyptian Inscriptions Indicates an Earlier Date for Origin of the Alphabet", *The New York Times* (New York, 13.11.1999).

Dodd, C.H.: *The Bible To-day* (Cambridge, 1952).

ad-Dulābī: *al-Kunā*, 2 vols. (Hyderabad, 1322).

Dutton, Y.: "An Early *Muṣḥaf* According to the Reading of Ibn ʿĀmir", *J. Qurʾānic Studies* 3/1 (2001), pp. 71-89.

_____: "Some Notes on the British Library's 'Oldest Qurʾan Manuscript' (Or. 2165)", *J. Qurʾānic Studies* 8/2 (2006), pp. 84-126.

E

Ehrman, B.D.: *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture* (Oxford, 1993).

Eisenman, R.H./J.M. Robinson: *A Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Washington, DC, 1991).

Elad, A.: "Community of Believers of 'Holy Men' and 'Saints' or Community of Muslims? The Rise and Development of Early Muslim Historiography," *J. Semitic Studies* 47 (2002), pp. 281-87.

Esposito, J.: *Islam: the Straight Path* (Expanded ed. New York, 1991).

"Esther", in I. Singer (ed.): *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, vol. 5 (New York/London, 1901-1912), p. 236.

F

Fallāta, ʿUmar bin Ḥasan: *al-Waḍʿu fī al-Ḥadīth*, 3 vols. (Beirut, 1401/1981).

al-Faryābī, Jaʿfar b. M. al-Ḥasan: *Faḍāʾil al-Qurʾān*, ed. Y. ʿUthmān (Riyāḍ, 1409/1989).

Freeman-Grenville, G.S.P.: *The Muslim and Christian Calendars* (٢nd ed. London, ١٩٧٧).

al-Fihris as-Shāmil li at-Turāth al-ʿArabī al-Islāmī al-Makhṭūṭ: al-Ḥadīth an-Nabawī ash-Sharīf wa ʿUlūmahu wa Rijāluhu, 3 vols. (ʿAmmān, 1991).

al-Finaisān, Saʿūd (ed.): *al-Badīʿ*, see al-Juhanī.

Fischman, D.: *Political Discourse in Exile: Karl Marx and the Jewish Question* (Massachusetts, 1991).

Ford, P.: "The Qurʾān as Sacred Scripture", *Muslim World* 83/2 (Apr 1993).

Funk, R.W./B.B. Scott/J.R. Butts: *The Parables of Jesus: Red Letter Edition* (Sonoma, 1988).

G

Ghabban, ʿA.: "Naqsh Zuhayr: Aqdam Naqsh Islāmī Muʾarrikh bi-Sanat 24 H", *Arabia Revue de Sabéologie* 1 (2003), pp. 293-342.

"Gentile", in I. Singer (ed.): *The Jewish Encyclopaedia*, vol. 5 (New York/London, 1901-1912), pp. 615-626.

Ghawri, A.S.: *The Only Son Offered for Sacrifice Isaac or Ishmael? With Zamzam, Al-Marwah, and Makkah in the Bible* (Lahore, 2004).

Gibb, H.A.R.: *Journal of Comparative Legislation and International Law, 3rd series*, vol. 34, parts 3-4 (1951).

Grohmann, A.: "Arabic Inscriptions", in *Expédition Philby-Ryckmans-Lippens en Arabie, IIe partie: textes épigraphiques*, tome 1 (Louvain, 1962).

_____: *Arabische Paläographie. II Teil: Das Schriftwesen. Die Lapidarshrift* (Wien, 1971).

_____: *Handbuch der Orientalistik. Erste Abteilung: Der Nahe und der Mittlere Osten. Ergänzungsband II, Erster Halbband, I Arabische Choronolgie, II Arabische Papyruskunde* (Leiden, 1966).

_____: "The Problem of Dating Early Qurʾans", *Der Islam* 33/3 (Sep 1958), pp. 213-31.

_____: "Zum Papyrusprotokoll in früharabischer Zeit", in *Jahrbücher der Österreichischen Byzantinischen Gesellschaft*, vol. 9 (Graz-Cologne, 1960).

_____: "Zum Problem Der Datierung Der Ältesten Koran-Handschriften" in H. Franke (ed.): *Akten Des Vierundzwanzigsten Internationalen Orientalisten-Kongresses München, 28 August – 4 September 1957* (Weisbaden, 1959), p. 272.

Gruendler, B.: *The Development of the Arabic Script* (Atlanta, 1993).

Guillaume, A.: *The Life of Muhammad: A Translation of Ibn Isḥāq's Sīrat Rasūl Allāh* (8th imp. Karachi, 1987).

_____: "Where was al-Masyid al-Aqsa", *al-Andalus* (Madrid, 1953).

H/Ḥ

al-Haithamī, ʿAlī b. Abū Bakr: *Majmaʿ az-Zawāʾid*, 10 vols. (Cairo, 1352).

Ḥājī Khalīfa, Muṣṭafā b. ʿAbdullāh: *Kashf aẓ-Ẓunūn* (3rd ed. Ṭehrān, 1387/1967).

al-Ḥākim, Muḥammad b. ʿAbdullāh: *al-Mustadrak*, ed. M.A. ʿAṭāʾ (Beirut, 1411/1990).

al-Hamadhānī, al-Ḥasan b. Aḥmad b. al-Ḥasan: *Ghāyat al-Ikhtiṣār*, ed. A.M. Ṭalʿat (Jeddah, 1414/1994).

Hämeen-Anttila, J.: "A Note on the ʿEn ʿAvdat Inscription", *Studia Orientala (Helsinki)* 67 (1991), pp. 33-36.

Hamidullah, M.: "The City State of Mecca", *Islamic Culture* 12 (1938), pp. 255-276.

_____: "The Practicability of Islam in This World", *Islamic Cultural Forum*, issue no. 7 (Tokyo, Apr 1977), pp. 11-21.

_____: *The First Written Constitution in the World* (Lahore, 1975).

_____: *Khuṭābāt Bhawalpur* (Islamabad, 1992).

_____: *Six Originaux des Lettres Diplomatiques du Prophete de L'Islam* (Paris, 1986/1406).

_____: *al-Wathāʾiq as-Siyāsiyya* (6th ed. Beirut, 1407/1987).

Harper's Modern German Grammar (London, 1960).

Ḥasan, ʿIzzat (ed.): *al-Muḥkam fī Naqṭ al-Maṣāḥif*, see ad-Dānī.

Hastings, J.: *Dictionary of the Bible* (2nd ed. Edinburgh, 1963).

Healey, J.F./G.R. Smith: "Jaussen-Savignac 17 - The Earliest Dated Arabic Document (A.D. 276)", *al-Aṭlāl* 12 (1410/1989), pp. 77-84 and 101-110 (Arabic section).

Higgins, A.: "The Lost Archive", *The Wall Street Journal* (12.1.2008).

al-Hindī, Raḥmatullāh b. Khalīlur-Raḥmān: *Iẓhār al-Ḥaq*, ed. ʿU. ad-Dasūqī, 2 vols. in 1 (ad-Dār al-Baiḍāʾ, no date).

Hoskyns, E./N. Davey: *The Riddle of the New Testament* (London, 1963).

"How Was Jesus Spelled?", *Biblical Archaeology Review* 26/3 (May/Jun 2000), p. 66.

Hoyland, R.G.: *Seeing Islam as Others Saw It: A Survey and Evaluation of Christian, Jewish and Zoroastrian Writings on Early Islam* (Princeton, 1997).

Humphreys, R.S.: *Islamic History: A Framework for Inquiry* (Revised ed. Princeton, 1991).

I/Ī

Ibn Abī Dāwūd: *Kitāb al-Maṣāḥif*, ed. A. Jeffery (Cairo, 1355/1936), in: id., *Materials for the History of the Text of the Qurʾān: The Old Codices* (Leiden, 1937).

_____: *Kitāb al-Maṣāḥif of Ibn Abī Dāwūd*, ed. M. Wāʿiẓ (2nd ed. Beirut, 2002).

Ibn Abī Shaiba, ʿAbdullāh b. Muḥammad: *Muṣannaf*, ed. M.A. Shāhīn, 9 vols. (Beirut, 1416/1995).

Ibn ʿAṭīyya, ʿAbdul-Ḥaq b. Ghālib al-Undulusī: *al-Muḥarrar al-Wajīz*, ed. an academic council in Fās, 16 vols. (Fās, 1395-1411/1975-1991).

Ibn Ḍurais, Muḥammad b. Ayyūb: *Faḍāʾil al-Qurʾān*, ed. G. Budair (Damascus, 1408/1987).

Ibn Ḥabīb, Muḥammad al-Baghdādī: *Kitāb al-Muḥabbar* (Hyderabad, 1361/1942).

Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī, Aḥmad b. ʿAlī: *Fatḥul Bārī*, ed. F. ʿAbdul-Bāqī, 13 vols. (Cairo, 1380-1390).

_____: *al-Iṣāba fī Tamyīz aṣ-Ṣaḥāba*, 4 vols. (Beirut, no date [reprint of first ed. Cairo, 1328]).

_____: *Nuzhat an-Naẓar Sharḥ Nukhbat al-Fikr fī Muṣṭalaḥi Ahl al-Athar* (Beirut, no date).

_____: *Taqrīb at-Tahdhīb*, ed. M. ʿAwwāma (3rd ed. Ḥalab, 1411/1991).

Ibn Ḥanbal, Aḥmad: *Musnad*, 6 vols. (Cairo, 1313). Reprinted by Qurṭuba Press (Cairo, no date [*c.* 1988]) with ḥadīth serials in the margin.

Ibn Ḥazm, ʿAlī b. Saʿīd: *Jamhrat al-Ansāb*, ed. E. Lévi-Provençal (Cairo, 1948).

Ibn Ḥibbān al-Bustī, Muḥammad: *al-Majrūḥīn.*, ed. M. Zāyed, 3 vols. (Ḥalab, 1396).

_____: *Kitāb ath-Thiqāt*, 9 vols. (Hyderabad, 1393-1403/1973-1983).

Ibn Hishām: *Sīra*, ed. M. Saqqā *et al*, 4 vols. (2nd ed. Cairo, 1375/1955).

Ibn Isḥāq: *as-Seyar wa al-Maghāzī – the version of Ibn Bukair*, ed. S. Zakkār (Damascus, 1398/1978).

Ibn al-Jazarī = al-Jazarī

Ibn al-Kalbī, Hishām b. Muḥammad: *Jamhrat an-Nasab*, ed. N. Hasan (Beirut, 1407/1986).

Ibn Kathīr, Ismāʿīl: *Faḍāʾil al-Qurʾān*, in vol. 7 of *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr.*

_____: *Tafsīr al-Qurʾān*, 7 vols. (Beirut, 1385/1966).

_____: *al-Bidāya wa an-Nihāya* (Cairo, 1348).

Ibn Manẓūr, Muḥammad b. Mukarram: *Mukhtaṣar Tārīkh Dimashq li Ibn ʿAsākir*, ed. M. aṣ-Ṣāgharjī, 29 vols. in 15 (Beirut/Damascus, 1409/1989).

Ibn Mujāhid: *Kitāb as-Sabʿa*, ed. S. Ḍaif (Cairo, 1972).

Ibn an-Nadīm = an-Nadīm

Ibn Qutaiba: *al-Maʿārif*, ed. Th. ʿUkāsha (Cairo, 1969).

____: *Taʾwīl Mushkil al-Qurʾān*, ed. S.A. Ṣaqr (Beirut, no date).

Ibn Saʿd, Muḥammad: *Kitāb aṭ-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*, ed. E. Sachau *et al*, 9 vols. (Leiden, 1905-1917).

Ibn Sayyīd an-Nās: *ʿUyūn al-Athar* (Cairo, 1356).

Ibn Shabba, ʿUmar: *Tārīkh al-Madīnah al-Munawwarh*, ed. F. Shaltūt, 4 vols. (Jeddah, no date).

Ibn Wahb, ʿAbdullāh: *al-Jāmiʿ*, ed. J. David-Weill (Cairo, 1939).

____: *al-Gamiʿ Die Koranwissenschaften (al-Jāmiʿ fi ʿUlūm al-Qurʾān)*, ed. M. Muranyi (Wiesbaden, 1992).

Ibn Warraq (ed.): *The Origins of the Koran: Classic Essays on Islam's Holy Book* (New York, 1998).

Ibrāhīm Jumʿa: *Dirāsātun fi Taṭawwur al-Kitābāt al-Kūfiyya* (Cairo, 1969).

al-Imam, A. ʿA.: *Variant Readings of the Qurʾan: A Critical Study of their Historical and Linguistic Origins* (London/Washington, 1427/2006).

Imamuddin, S.M.: *Arabic Writing and Arab Libraries* (London, 1983).

The Independent (UK daily, 19.11.2000).

Iqlaimis, Y.D.: *al-Lamʿa ash-Shahīyya fi Naḥw al-Lugha as-Siryāniyya* (2nd edition, Mosul, 1896).

"Islamic Coins - The Turath Collection Part I", *Spink* (London, 1999).

J

al-Jazāʾirī, Ṭāhir: *at-Tibyān*, ed. A. Abū Ghuddah (3rd ed. Beirut, 1412/1992).

al-Jazarī, Muḥammad b. Muḥammad: *Ṭabaqāt al-Qurrāʾ*, 3 vols. (Baghdad, 1351/1932).

Jeffery, A. (ed.): *al-Mabānī*, in: id., *Muqaddimatān fi ʿUlūm al-Qurʾān* (Cairo, 1954).

____ (ed.): *al-Maṣāḥif*, see Ibn Abī Dāwūd.

____: *Materials for the History of the Text of the Qurʾān: The Old Codices* (Leiden, 1937).

____ (ed.): *Muqaddimatān fi ʿUlūm al-Qurʾān (Two Muqaddimas to the Qurʾānic Sciences)* (Cairo, 1954).

____: "N. Abbott: The Rise of the North Arabic Script and It's Kurʾānic Development, Chicago, 1938", *The Moslem World* 30 (1940), pp. 191-198.

____: *The Qurʾān as Scripture* (New York, 1952).

____: "The Textual History of the Qurʾān", in Op. cit., pp. 89-103.

____/I. Mendelsohn: "The Orthography of the Samarqand Qurʾan Codex", *JAOS* 62/3 (1942), pp. 175-94.

Jones, A.: "The dotting of a script and the dating of an era: the strange neglect of PERF 558", *Islamic Culture* 72 (1998), pp. 95-103.

Josephus, F.: *The Works of Josephus: Complete and Unabridged in One Volume*, trans. W. Whiston (7th printing, Peabody, 1992).

al-Juhanī, Muḥammad b. Yūsuf: *al-Badīʿ fi Rasm Maṣāḥif ʿUthmān*, ed. S. al-Finaisān (Riyāḍ, 1419/1998).

Jumʿa, Ibrāhīm = Ibrāhīm Jumʿa

Juynboll, G.H.A.: *Muslim Tradition* (Cambridge, 1983).

K

Kaḥḥāla, ʿUmar Riḍā: *Muʿjam al-Muwʾallifīn* (Beirut, 1414/1993).

al-Kattānī, ʿAbdul-Ḥay: *Niẓām al-Ḥukūma an-Nabawīyya (at-Tarātīb al-Idārīya)*, 2 vols. (Beirut, no date).

Kawatoko, M.: "Archaeological Survey of Najran and Madinah 2002", *al-Aṭlāl* 18 (1426/2005), pp. 51-52.

Keck, L.E. *et al* (eds.): *The New Interpreter's Bible: General Articles & Introduction, Commentary, & Reflections for each Book of the Bible, Including the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books in Twelve Volumes*, 12 vols. (Nashville, 1994-2004).

Khalīfa bin Khayyāṭ: *Tārīkh*, ed. S. Zakkār, 2 vols. (Damascus, 1968).

Khān, Isḥāq: *al-Uṣūl as-Sitta wa Ruwātuhā* (M.A thesis, King Saud University, Riyāḍ, 1405/1985).

al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Aḥmad b. ʿAlī: *al-Faqīh wa al-Mutafaqqih*, 2 vols. (Riyāḍ).

____: *al-Jāmiʿ li Akhlāq ar-Rāwī wa Ādāb as-Sāmiʿ*, ed. M. Ṭaḥḥān, 2 vols. (Riyāḍ, 1403/1983)

____: *al-Kifāya fi ʿilm ar-Riwāyah* (Hyderabad, 1357).

____: *ar-Riḥla fi Ṭalab al-Ḥadīth* , ed. N. ʿItr (Damascus, 1395/1975).

Koester, H.: "Historic Mistakes Haunt the Relationship of Christianity and Judaism", *Biblical Archaeology Review* 21/2 (Mar./Apr. 1995), pp. 26-27.

____: "What Is - And Is Not – Inspired", *Bible Review* 11/5 (Oct 1995), pp. 18, 48.

Koren, J./Y.D. Nevo: "Methodological Approaches to Islamic Studies", *Der Islam* 68/1 (1991), pp. 87-107.

Krenkow, F.: "Kitābkhāna", in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, First Edition, vol. 4 (Leiden/London, 1927), pp. 1045-47.

L

Latourette, K.S.: *Christianity through the Ages* (New York, 1965).

Lebedev, V.V.: "The Oldest Complete Codex of the Hebrew Bible", in *The Leningrad Codex: A Facsimile Edition* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge, 1998), pp. xxi-xxviii.

Lester, T.: "What is Koran?", *The Atlantic Monthly* 283/1 (Jan 1999), pp. 43-56.

Levinus Warner His Legacy – Catalogue of the commemorative exhibition held in the Bibliotheca Thysiana from April 27th till May 15th 1970, (Leiden, 1970).

Los Angeles Times (US daily, 17.8.2008).

Lunn, A.: *The Revolt Against Reason* (London, 1950).

M

Mack, B.L.: *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q & Christian Origins* (San Francisco, 1993).

Mālik b. Anas: *al-Muwaṭṭa'*, ed. M.F. ʿAbdul-Bāqī (Cairo, 1370/1951).

____: *al-Muwaṭṭa' (Recension of Suwaid al-Ḥadathānī)*, ed. A. Turkī (Beirut, 1994).

Margoliouth, D.S.: "Textual Variations", *The Moslem World* 15/4 (Oct 1925), pp. 334-344.

Maṣāḥif Ṣanʿā', a catalogue to accompany "Maṣāḥif Ṣanʿā'" exhibition held at Kuwait National Museum, 19 March - 19 May 1985.

Mascall, E.L.: *The Secularization of Christianity* (London, 1965).

Metzger, B.M.: *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (3rd enlarged ed. Oxford, 1992).

____/M.D. Coogan (eds.): *The Oxford Companion to the Bible* (Oxford, 1993).

Miles, G.C.: "Early Islamic Inscriptions Near Ṭā'if, in the Ḥijāz", *JNES* 7/4 (Oct 1948), pp. 236-42.

Milward, P.: *Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age: A Survey of Printed Sources* (London, 1978).

Mingana, A.: "Transmission of the Koran", *The Moslem World* 7 (1917), pp. 223-232, 402-414. Reprinted in Ibn Warraq (ed.): *The Origins of the Koran: Classic Essays on Islam's Holy Book* (New York, 1998), pp. 97-113.

____/A.S. Lewis (eds.): *Leaves from Three Ancient Qurâns, Possibly Pre-ʿOthmânic with a list of their Variants* (Cambridge, 1914).

al-Mizzī, Jamāl ad-Dīn Abū al-Ḥajjāj Yūsuf: *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl fī Asmā' ar-Rijāl*, ed. B. ʿAwwād, 35 vols. (Beirut, 1400-1413/1980-1992).

Mones, H.: *Atlas of the History of Islam* (Cairo, 1987).

Montagu, B. (ed.): *The Works of Francis Bacon* (London, 1831).

Moreland, F.L./R.M. Fleischer: *Latin: An Intensive Course* (9th printing, London, 1990).

Moritz, B.: "Arabic Writing", *Encyclopeadia of Islam* (1st ed. Leiden, 1913).

Muir, W.: *Annals of the Early Caliphate* (Amsterdam, 1968 [reprint of London, 1883 edition]).

____: *The Life of Mahomet* (3rd ed. London, 1894).

al-Munaggid, S.: *Etudes De Paleographie Arabe* (Beirut, 1972).

al-Munīf, A.: *Dirāsa Fannīya li Muṣḥaf Mubakkir* (Riyāḍ, 1418/1998).

al-Muraekhī, M.K.: "Naqsh Raqūsh bil-Ḥijr (Madā'in Ṣāleḥ) ʿRu'yah Jadidah'" *Deliberations of the Scientific Meeting of the Association of History and Archaeology in the Gulf GCC* (Dubai, 1419/1999).

____/ʿA. Ghabbān: "Naqsh Wā'il bin al-Jazzār at-Tizkārī al-Mu'arrakh biʿām 410", *Deliberations of the third Annual Scientific Meeting of the Association* (Muscat 1422/2001).

Muslim b. al-Ḥajjāj al-Qushairī: *Kitāb at-Tamyīz*, ed. M.M. al-Aʿẓamī, in: id., *Manhajin Naqd ʿInd al-Muḥaddithīn* (3rd ed. Riyāḍ, 1410/1990).

____: *Ṣaḥīḥ*, ed. F. ʿAbdul-Bāqī, 5 vols. (Cairo, 1374). English translation by Abdul-Hamid Siddiqi: *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, 4 vols. (Lahore, 1972).

N

an-Nadīm, Muḥammad b. Isḥāq al-Warrāq: *al-Fihrist*, ed. R. Tajdud (Tehran, no date).

an-Naḥawī, Abū Ḥayyān: *Tafsīr Baḥr al-Muḥīṭ*, 8 vols. (Riyāḍ, no date).

Najjār, ʿAbdul-Ḥalīm: *Madhāhib at-Tafsīr al-Islāmī* (Cairo, 1955).

an-Nās = Ibn Sayyīd an-Nās

an-Nasā'ī: *Kitāb aḍ-Ḍuʿfā' wa al-Matrūkīn* (Haleb, 1396/1976).

Negev, A./J. Naveh/S. Shaked: "Obodas the God", *Israel Exploration Journal* 36/1-2 (1986), pp. 56-60.

Neusner, J.: *The Way of Torah: An Introduction to Judaism* (4th edition, Belmont, 1988).

The New Testament = Bible

Newman, B.M.: "CEV's Chief Translator: We Were Faithful to the Intention of the Text", *Bible Review* 12/5 (Oct 1996), pp. 43, 51.

Nöldeke, T.: "The Koran", *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, vol. 16 (9th ed., 1891), pp. 597ff. Reprinted in Ibn Warraq (ed.): *The Origins of the Koran: Classic Essays on Islam's Holy Book* (New York, 1998), pp. 36-63.

____: Geschichte des Qorāns (Hildesheim/New York, 1981 [reprint of Leipzig, 1909 edition]).

an-Nuwairī, Aḥmad b. ʿAbdul-Wahhāb: *Nihāyatul Arab fī Funūn al-Adab* (Cairo, no date).

P

Peres, S: *An interview with*, see "Talking with David Frost"

Pissareff, S.: *Coran Coufique de Samarcand: écrit d'après la tradition de la propre main du troisième calife Osman (644-656), qui se trouve dans la Bibliothèque Impériale Publique de St. Pétersbourg* (St. Petersberg, 1905).

Pretzl, O.: "Die Fortführung des Apparatus Criticus zum Koran", *Sitzungsberichte Bayer. Akad.* 5 (München, 1934).

Puin, G.R.: "Methods of Research on Qur'ānic Manuscripts - A Few Ideas", in *Maṣāḥif Ṣanʿā'* (Dar al-Athar al-Islamiyyah, Kuwait, 1405/1985), pp. 9-17.

____: "Neue Wege der Koranforschung II: Über die Bedeutung der ältesten Koranfragmente aus Sanaa (Jemen) für die Orthographiegeschichte des Korans", *Magazin Forschung* (Jan 1999), pp. 37-40.

____: "Observations on Early Qur'an Manuscripts in Ṣanʿā'", in S. Wild (ed.): *The Qur'an as Text* (Leiden, 1996), pp. 107-11.

Q

Qaddūrī, Ghānim: *Rasm al-Muṣḥaf: Dirāsatun Lughawiyyatun Tarīkhīyyatun* (Baghdad, 1402/1982).

al-Qāḍī, ʿAbdul-Fattāḥ: "al-Qirā'āt fī Naẓar al-Mustashriqīn wa al-Mulḥidīn", *Majallat al-Azhar* 42 (1390/1970), pp. 748-752; 43 (1391/1971), pp. 65-82, 174, 177, 369-372, 472-486, 627-632, 736-741, 821-826.

Qojman, Y.: *Qāmūs ʿIbrī-ʿArabī* (Beirut, 1970).

"Queen", *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* (4th ed. Boston, 2000).

Qurʾān: *Facsimile editions*, see T. Altikulaç: *Muṣḥaf of ʿUthmān at Topkapi Palace Museum and at the Museum of Islamic Art*. See F. Déroche: *Muṣḥafs at Bibliotheque Nationale de France (arabe 328a) and at British Library (Or 2165)*. See also E. Rezvan: *Muṣḥaf of ʿUthmān at St. Petersburg*. And see also D.S. Rice: *Muṣḥaf of Ibn al-Bawwāb*.

al-Qurʾān al-Karīm (Madinah, no date). Rendered it's meaning into English ʿA. Yūsuf ʿAlī: *The Holy Qurʾān: Text, Translation and Commentary* (New revised ed. Brentwood, 1409/1989). Another rendition Muḥammad Asad: *The Message of the Qurʾān* (Gibraltar, 1984).

al-Qurṭubī, Abū ʿAbdullāh Muḥammad b, Aḥmad al-Anṣārī: *al-Jāmiʿ li Aḥkām al-Qurʾān*, 20 vols. in 10 (Cairo, 1966).

Qutb, M.: *al-Mustashriqūn wa al-Islām* (Cairo, 1999).

R

Raḍwān,ʿU.: *Ārāʾ al-Mustashriqīn Ḥawl al-Qurʾān al-Karīm wa Tafsīr: Dirāsah wa Naqd* (Riyāḍ, 1413/1992).

ar-Rāmahurmuzī, al-Ḥasan b. ʿAbdur-Raḥmān: *al-Muḥaddith al-Fāṣil*, ed. M.A. al-Khaṭīb (Beirut, 1404/1984).

ar-Rāshid, S.: *Dirāsāt fī al-Āthār al-Islāmiyyah al-Mubakkirah bi al-Madinah al-Munawwarah* (Riyāḍ, 1421/2000).

____: *Kitābāt Islāmīyya min Makkat al-Mukarrama* (Riyāḍ, 1416/1995).

ar-Razī: *Tārīkh Madīnat Ṣanʿāʾ*, ed. Ḥ. al-ʿUmarī (Damascus, 1409/1989).

Reland, H.: *Four Treatises Concerning the Doctrine, Discipline and Worship of the Mahometans* (London, 1712).

Rezvan, E.: *The Qurʾān of ʿUthmān (St. Petersburg, Katta-Langar, Bukhara, Tashkent)*, vol. 1 (St. Petersburg, 2004).

Rice, D.S. (commentary): *Le Coran. Précédé d'une étude de Jacques Berque, Traduit de l'arabe par Jean Grosjean. Les illustrations sont des sérigraphies originales de Zenderoudi, accompagné du manuscrit d'Ibn al-Bawwab*, 4 vols. in 3 (Paris, 1972).

Rippen, A.: "Literary analysis of Qurʾān, Tafsīr, and Sīra: The Methodologies of John Wansbrough", in R.C. Martin (ed.): *Approaches to Islam in Religious Studies* (Tucson, 1985).

ar-Riyāḍ (Saudi daily, 27.8.1420/5.11.1999).

____: (Saudi daily, 1.1.2000).

____: (Saudi daily, 10.11.1424/2.1.2004).

____: (Saudi daily, 12.4.1426/20.5.2006).

Rizqallāh, Mahdī: *as-Sīra an-Nabawīyya* (Riyāḍ, 1412/1992).

Robert, A./A. Feuillet (eds.): *Introduction à la Bible*, 2 vols. (1959). English translation by P.W. Skehan *et al*: *Interpreting the Scriptures* (New York, 1969).

Robson, J.: "The Transmission of Ibn Maga's Sunan", *J. Semitic Studies* 3 (1958), pp. 129-141.

Rowley, H.H.: *The OT and Modern Study* (Oxford, 1961).

Ruska, J.: "Ḥunain b. Isḥāk", in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, First Edition, vol. 3 (Leiden/London, 1927), p. 336.

S/Ṣ

as-Sāʿātī, ʿAbdur-Raḥmān: *Minḥat al-Maʿbūd* (Cairo, no date).

as-Sadūsī, al-Muʿarrij: *Kitāb Ḥadhfin min Nasab Quraish*, ed. al-Munajjid (Cairo, no date).

Saeed, A.: "Rethinking 'Revelation' as a Precondition for Reinterpreting the Qurʾan: A Qurʾanic Perspective", *J. Qurʾanic Studies*, 1/1 (1999), pp. 93-114.

Said, E.: *Covering Islam* (New York, 1981).

____: *Orientalism* (New York, 1979).

as-Sanʿānī, ʿAbdur-Razzāq: *Muṣannaf*, ed. Ḥabibur-Raḥmān al-Aʿẓamī, 11 vols. (2nd ed. Beirut, 1403/1983).

Schacht, J.: *An Introduction to Islamic Law* (Oxford, 1964).

____: *The Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence* (2nd edition, Oxford, 1959).

Schaeffer, C.F.A.: "Secrets from Syrian Hills", *The National Geographic Magazine* 64/1 (Jul 1933), pp. 96-126.

Schweitzer, A.: *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (New York, 1968).

ash-Shāfiʿī, Muḥammad b. Idrīs, *ar-Risālah*, ed. A. Shākir (Cairo, 1940).

Shahak, I.: *Jewish History, Jewish Religion* (London, 1977).

Shāhīn, ʿAbduṣ-Ṣabūr: *Tārīkh al-Qurʾān* (Cairo, 1966).

Shākir, A. (ed.): *ar-Risālah of ash-Shāfiʿī*, see ash-Shāfiʿī.

ash-Shalabī, ʿAbdul-Fattāḥ Ismāʿīl.: *Rasm al-Muṣḥaf wa al-Iḥtijāj bihi fī al-Qirāʾāt* (Cairo, 1380/1960).

ash-Shāmī, Moḥammad b. Yūsuf aṣ-Ṣāliḥī: *Subul al-Hudā* , ed. M. ʿAbdul-Wāḥid *et al* (Cairo, 1392/1972).

Shanks, H.: "Books in Brief", *Biblical Archaeology Review* 21/5 (Sep/Oct 1995), pp. 6, 8.

____: "Is This Man a Biblical Archaeologist?", *Biblical Archaeology Review* 22/4 (Jul/Aug 1996), pp. 30-39, 62-63.

____: "New Carbon-14 Tests Leave Room for Debate", *Biblical Archaeology Review* 21/4 (Jul/Aug 1995), p. 61.

____: "New Orleans Gumbo: Plenty of Spice at Annual Meeting", *Biblical Archaeology Review* 23/2 (Mar/Apr 1997), pp. 54-59, 69.

____: "Ousted Chief Scroll Editor Makes His Case: An Interview with John Strugnell", *Biblical Archaeology Review* 20/4 (Jul/Aug 94), pp. 40-47, 57.

____: "Scholar Claims Palestinian History is Suppressed in Favor of Israelites", *Biblical Archaeology Review* 22/2 (Mar/Apr 1996), pp. 54, 56, 69.

____: "Scholars, Scrolls, Secrets and 'Crimes'", in Eisenman, R.H./J.M. Robinson: *A Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (First printing Washington, DC, 1991).

Sharafaddin, A.H.: "Some Islamic inscriptions discovered on the Darb Zubayda", *al-Aṭlāl* 1 (1397/1977), pp. 69-70.

ash-Sharq al-Awsaṭ (Saudi daily, 18.2.1999).

Shebunin, A.: "Kuficheskiy Koran Imperatorskoy Sankt-Peterburgskoy Publichnoy Biblioteki", *Zapiski Vostochnogo Otdeleniia Imperatosrkogo Russkogo Arkheologicheskogo Obshchestva* 6 (St. Petersburg, 1892), pp. 69-133.

as-Sibāʿī, Muṣṭafā: *as-Sunna wa Makānatuhā fī at-Tashrīʿ al-Islāmī* (Cairo, 1380/1961).

Siddiqui, A.H.: *The Life of Mohammad* (Karachi, 1969).

Siddiqui, W.H./A.S. Islahi: *Hindi-Urdu Catalogue of the exhibition held on the occasion of the celebration of the 50th Anniversary of India's Independence and 200 years of Rampur Raza Library* (New Delhi, 2000).

Smith, W.C.: "The True Meaning of Scripture", *IJMES* 11 (1980), pp. 487-505.

Stillman, N.A.: *The Jews of Arab Lands: A History and Source Book* (Philadelphia, 1979).

Ṣubḥah, N.: *Shuhadāʾ aṣ-Ṣaḥāba wa Aʿlāmuhum fī Falasṭīn* (٢٠٠٠).

aṣ-Ṣūlī, Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā: *Adab al-Kuttāb*, ed. B. al-Atharī (Cairo, 1341).

The Sunday Times (UK daily, 26 Jan 1997).

as-Suyūṭī, Jalāl ad-Dīn ʿAbdur-Raḥmān b. Abī Bakr: *ad-Durr al-Manthūr*, 6 vols. (Ṭehrān, 1377).

_____: *al-Itqān fī ʿUlūm al-Qurʾān*, ed. M. Abū al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm, 4 vols. (Cairo, 1387/1967).

_____: *Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥuffāẓ*, ed. ʿA.M. ʿUmar (Cairo, 1973).

_____: *Tadrīb ar-Rāwī*, ed. A.A. Laṭīf (Cairo, 1379/1959).

T/Ṭ

aṭ-Ṭabarī, Muḥammad b. Jarīr: *Tafsīr*, 30 vols. (3rd ed. Cairo, 1388/1968).

_____: *Tārīkh*, ed. M. Abū al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm, 10 vols. (Cairo, 1967).

"Talking with David Frost: Shimon Peres", aired in US on Public Broadcasting System (29.3.1996), transcript no. 53.

ath-Thawra (Yemeni daily, 24.11.1419/11.3.1999).

Thompson, J.: "Bible's King David exposed as despot who did not kill Goliath", *The Independent* (London, 19.11.2000).

Thomson, R.W. (trans): *The Armenian History attributed to Sebeos; Part I: Translation and Notes; Part II: Historical Commentary* (Liverpool, 1999).

The Times (UK daily, 28.7.1967).

at-Tirmidhī: *Sunan*, ed. A. Shākir *et al* (Cairo, 1356/1937).

"Are Torah Scrolls Exactly the Same?", *Bible Review* 13/6 (Dec 1997), pp. 5-6.

Treharne, R.F. (ed.), *Muir's Atlas of Medieval and Modern History*, (London, 1982 [reprint of the 11th edition, 1969]).

Tyndale, W.: *The 1526 New Testament Translation by*, see Bible.

U/Ū

Ulrich, E./F.M. Cross/J.R. Davila/N. Jastram/J.E. Sanderson/E. Tov/J. Strugnell: *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, vol. XII, Qumran Cave 4 - VII: Genesis to Numbers* (Oxford, 1994).

ʿUrwah b. az-Zubair: *al-Maghāzī*, compiled by M.M. al-Aʿẓamī (Riyāḍ, 1401/1981).

al-ʿUthmānī, Ismāʿīl: *Monthly al-Mishkāt* 8 (1419).

V

Vermes, G.: *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (Revised first ed. Great Britain, 1965).

W

Wahb b. Munabbih: *Maghāzī Rasūlullāh*, ed. R.G. Khoury, 2 vols. (Wiesbaden, 1972).

The Wall Street Journal (US daily, 12.1.2008).

Würthwein, E.: *The Text of the Old Testament*, translated by E.F. Rhodes (2nd ed. revised and enlarged, Grand Rapids, 1995). [The original German first edition: *Der Text des Alten Testaments* (5th ed., Stuttgart, 1988)].

Wagner, S.M./A.D. Breck (eds.): *Great Confrontations in Jewish History* (Denver, 1977).

Wansbrough, J.: *Quranic Studies: Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation* (Oxford, 1977).

Wells, G.A.: *Did Jesus exist?* (London, 1986).

Wensinck, A.J.: *Muslim Creed* (Cambridge, 1932).

"William Tyndale", in *Encyclopaedia Britannica (Micropaedia)*, vol. x (15th ed. Chicago, 1974), p. 218.

Wild, S.: Preface to S. Wild (ed.): *The Qur'an as Text* (Leiden, 1996), pp. vii-xi.

Wilfinson, I.: *Tārīkh al-Lugāt as-Sāmiyya* (Beirut, no date).

Wilford, J.N.: "Discovery of Egyptian Inscriptions Indicates an Earlier Date for Origin of the Alphabet", *The New York Times* (13 Nov 1999).

Winnett, F.V./W.L. Reed: *Ancient Records from North Arabia* (Toronto, 1970).

Y

al-Yamānī, al-Muʿallimī: *at-Tankīl*, ed. N.A. al-Albānī (Beirut, 1386).

al-Yaʿqūbī, Aḥmad b. Abī Yaʿqūb: *Tārīkh*, 2 vols. (Beirut, 1379/1960).

Z/Ẓ

az-Zarakhshī, Badruddīn: *al-Burhān fī ʿUlūm al-Qurʾān*, ed. M. Abū al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm, 4 vols. (Cairo, 1376/1957).

Zia, S.A.: *A History of Jewish Crimes* (Karachi, 1969).

az-Zuhrī: *Tanzīl al-Qurʾān*, ed. al-Munajjid (Beirut, 1963).

INDEX

A
Aaron. *See* Hārūn
ʿAbbad bin Ṣuhayb, 106-7
Abbott, Nabia, 124-6, 129
abbreviation in early muṣḥafs, 144-9
ʿAbd-Manāf, 21
ʿAbdu, Muḥammad, 7
ʿAbdul Rahmān bin Hishām, 97
ʿAbdul-Aʿlā bin Ḥakam al-Kilābī, 105
ʿAbdul-Dār, 21
ʿAbdul-Fattāḥ al-Qāḍī, 103
ʿAbdul-Fattaḥ ash-Shalabī, 145
ʿAbdul-Ḥakam bin ʿAmr al-Jumaḥī, 112
ʿAbdullāh bin ʿAbbās
  on arrangement of verses, 77
  committee for compilation of Qurʾān, 97
  ḥadīth on merit of listening to Qurʾān, 61
  on origin of Arabic characters, 130
  on placement of verses of the Qurʾān, 75
  on recitation with Jibrīl, 54
  recognition of Ibn Masʿūd's scholarship, 237
  on recording of the Qurʾān, 71-2
  on revelation of Qurʾān, 47
  on trade in muṣḥafs, 111
ʿAbdullāh bin ʿAbdul-Muṭṭalib, 22
ʿAbdullāh bin Aḥmad bin al-Khashshāb, 225
ʿAbdullāh bin ʿAmr, 61, 97
ʿAbdullāh bin al-Arqam, 63
ʿAbdullāh bin Masʿūd
  among the authority reciters, 233
  beliefs of, 237-8
  exclusion from ʿUthmān's committee, 233
  as first teacher of Qurʾān, 64
  ḥadīth on reciting the Qurʾān, 60
  humility of, 236-7
  irregular muṣḥaf, 77
  learnt directly from the Prophet, 65, 238
  on oral transmission of Qurʾān, 166
  ordered to teach Qurʾān with Quraishī dialect, 95-6
  Orientalist use of aberrant narrations concerning Muṣḥaf of, 197-8
  on recitation with Jibrīl, 54
  sent to Kūfa, 92
  on trade in muṣḥafs, 110-1
  unanimous praise for, 236
  See also Ibn Masʿūd's Muṣḥaf
ʿAbdullāh bin Mughaffal al-Muzanī, 66
ʿAbdullāh bin Saʿd bin Abī aṣ-Ṣarḥ, 73
ʿAbdullāh bin aṣ-Ṣāʾib, 103
ʿAbdullāh bin Saʿīd bin al-ʿĀṣ, 65
ʿAbdullāh bin Salām, 65
ʿAbdullāh bin ʿUmar, 61, 97, 111
ʿAbdullāh bin az-Zubair, 97, 99
ʿAbdul-Muṭṭalib, 21-22
ʿAbdur-Raḥmān bin ʿAuf
  conversion of, 26, 63
  described as being ʿadl, 209
ʿAbdur-Raḥmān bin Khālid bin al-ʿĀṣ, 137
ʿAbdur-Raḥmān bin Yazīd, 236
ʿAbdur-Razzāq (mufassir), 228
ʿAbdur-Razzāq, Muṣannaf of, 218
ʿAbduṣ-Ṣabūr Shāhīn, 214
Abijah, 259
Abiram, 255
Abraham. *See* Ibrāhīm
Abū ʿAbdur-Raḥmān as-Sulamī, 103
Abū al-ʿAlāʾ al-Hamdhānī al-ʿAṭṭār, 228
Abū al-ʿĀliya, 111

- Abū al-Aswad ad-Du'alī, 156-8, 162, 177-8, 185
- Abū Bakr aṣ-Ṣiddīq
  - compilation of Qur'ān, 84-9, 336
  - conversion to Islam, 25, 63
  - caliphate of, 35-37
  - Imamate of, 60-1
  - migration to Madinah, 30
  - prevented from reciting Qur'ān, 52
- Abū Bakr bin ʿAyyāsh, 191
- Abū ad-Dardā', 92, 167, 229, 233
- Abū Ḥayyān an-Naḥawī, 233
- Abū Huraira ʿAbdur Raḥmān ad-Dawsī
  - ḥadīth illustrating proliferation of knowledge, 207-209
  - ḥadīth on seeking knowledge, 59
  - on recitation with Jibrīl, 54
- Abū Isḥāq, 236
- Abū Jahl
  - battle of Badr, 32
  - eavesdropping the Prophet, 51
- Abū Khuzaima al-Anṣārī, 90, 99
- Abū Lū'lū'a, 93
- Abū Masʿūd al-Anṣārī, 60
- Abū Masʿūd al-Badrī, 77
- Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥimmanī,108-9
- Abū Mūsā al-Ashʿarī, 92, 105, 233
- Abū al-Qāsim bin bint Aḥmad bin Manīʿ, 220-1
- Abū al-Qāsim bin Muḥammad, 220
- Abū Qilāba, 105
- Abū Rajā' al-ʿAṭāradī, 92
- Abū Saʿīd al-Khuḍarī, 67
- Abu Saʿīd, 220
- Abū Salama, 63
- Abū Sufyān bin Ḥarb
  - battle of Badr, 32
  - conversion of, 34
  - eavesdropping the Prophet, 51
- Abū Ṭālib bin ʿAbdul-Muṭṭalib, 28
- Abū ʿUbaid, 98, 164
- Abū ʿUbaidah bin al-Jarrāḥ, 37, 63, 67
- Abū Umāmah al-Bāhilī, 39
- Abū Umayya, 24
- Abū Wā'il, 238
- Abū Yūsuf, 215
- Abū Zaid, Naṣr, 7, 9, 245
- accuracy of ḥadīth narrators, 211-2
- ad-Dānī, Abū ʿAmr, 102, 148, 158, 165
- ad-Du'alī. *See* Abū al-Aswad ad-Du'alī
- adh-Dhahabī, Muḥammad bin Aḥmad, 214
- Adoptionism, 310, 322-3
- adultery, accusations of against Jesus, 304-5
- ʿadl (muḥaddithīn term), 209, 212
- ʿAffān, 211-212
- Africa, 15
- Africa, early creed of, 307
- Ahab, 258
- Ahaz, 259
- Ahaziah, 260
- Ahijah, 257
- Aḥmad bin Ḥanbal, xxii, 215, 220-1
- al-Aḥmar, ʿAbdullāh bin Ḥusain, xxiii
- aḥruf, 192
- Aḥsā' (eastern region of the Arabian peninsula), 133
- ʿAin at-Tamr, 36
- Aʿinna (early Makkan institution), 21
- ʿĀ'isha bint Abī Bakr
  - ḥadīth on leading the prayer, 60
  - on revelation of Qur'ān, 48
  - revelation concerning slander of, 49
  - ṣuḥuf of, 99-100
- Akbar (Moghul emperor), 303
- al-Akhnas bin Sharīq, 51
- Akiba, Rabbi, 283
- al-Akwaʿ, al-Qāḍī Ismāʿīl, xxiii, 12
- al-ʿAlā' bin al-Ḥaḍramī, 36
- Alexander the Great, 262, 269
- Alexandrian text, NT text type, 317
- ʿAlī bin Abī Ṭālib
  - among the authority reciters, 233
  - ḥadīth on learning the Qur'ān, 60
  - muṣḥaf attributed to, 145
  - Orientalist use of aberrant narrations concerning, 198
  - remains in Makkah, 30
  - support for ʿUthmān, 96, 103
- ʿAlī bin Aṣmaʿ 108
- ʿAlī bin Ḥusain, 110
- alif, irregularities in the writing of
  - dropped for abbreviation, 144-8
  - in the muṣḥaf at Topkapi Sarayi, 177
  - Puin and the Ṣanʿā' fragments, 149-50
  - written as wāw, 149
  - written as ya', 149-50
- Allāh (Almighty), attributes of, 44-5
- Alphabet
  - early Arabic, 131-4
  - invention of the first, 270
  - Mingana's theory on Arabic, 123-4, 132-4, 160-3
  - Phoenician, 123
  - Phoenician-Old Hebrew, 272
- ʿAlqama, 111, 238
- Altikulaç, T., 175-80, 182, 348
- al-Aʿmash, 214, 234, 236
- al-Amīn, 24
- Amīn, Aḥmad, 7
- Āmina bint Wahb, 22, 24
- ʿĀmir bin ʿAbd Qais, 103
- amending errors in muṣḥafs, 104-6
- Amon, 260
- ʿAmr bin Salima al-Jarmī, 60
- ʿAmr bin Um-Maktūm al-Aʿmā, 73
- ʿAmr bin al-ʿĀṣ, 36, 37
- ʿAmr bin Murra, 111
- Amram, 252
- Amuru, 15
- Amwāl muḥajjara (early Makkan institution), 21
- Anas bin Mālik, 67, 97, 105, 214
- Anbār (city), 36
- angels, 61
- Anṣār
  - establishment of Aws and Kharaj, 18
  - support of in battle of Badr, 32-3
  - as teachers of the Qur'ān, 66-7
- Antiochus, 262
- anti-Semitism, 353-5, 371
- apostasy, 35
- ʿAqaba, pledge of, 29-30
- Arabian peninsula, 15
- Arabic
  - diacritical marks, 156-8
  - dotting schemes, 151-6
  - early Arabic alphabet, 131-4
  - early Christian Arabic manuscripts, 124
  - history of the Arabic characters, 123-6
  - inscription, earliest dated, 126-7
  - inscriptions on coinage, 139
  - irregularities in non-Qur'ānic script, 163-5
  - suitability of for Divine revelation, 202
- Arabs, 15-16
  - as tribal society, 20-1
  - pre-Islamic religions, 22-3
- Aramaeans, 161
- Aramaic Nabatean script, 123, 125
  - compared with Arabic, 126, 129
  - language of the Nabateans, 129-31
- Aramaic, 270-1
- archival of ṣuḥuf, 91
- ʿarḍ (muḥaddithīn term), 216
- ʿArfaja bin Ḥarthama, 36
- Ark of the Israelites, 255, 266-7
- Arkoun, Muḥammad, 7, 245
- Armenia, 15, 95
- Asʿad bin Zurāra, 63
- Asa, 259
- ascension, 330
- asceticism, 322
- al-Aṣfahānī, 228
- Asher, 252
- Ashnāq (early Makkan institution), 21
- ʿĀṣim al-Jaḥdarī, 108
- ʿĀsim bin Abī an-Najūd, 198
- assassination attempt on the Prophet, 30
- Assyrian rule of Judah, 259
- Assyrian script, 271
- Assyriology, 353
- astigmatism, 322
- al-Aswad al-ʿAnsī, 36
- al-Aswad, 238
- Aswān, tombstone, 136
- atbāʿ at-tābiʿīn, 215
- Athār of Abū Yūsuf, 215
- Atjeyhnese people, 358
- Atlantic Monthly, The, 3
- atonement, 330
- ʿAuja Ḥafir, 154
- Aws (tribe), 18, 31
- ʿAwwād, K, 124, 348
- āyah (verse) separators, 116-20, 172
- Aysār (early Makkan institution), 21
- Azerbaijan, 95

B

- Baal, worship of in Israel, 258, 260
- Babylon, 15, 261
- Babylonian Talmud, 263
  - alteration of text, 272
  - pointing (vocalization), 284-5
- Badr, prelude to the battle, 32-3
- Baḥrain, 36
- Bakka, 17
- Bakr (tribe), 34
- baptism, 329
- al-Bāqillānī, 235
- Bar Kochba, 289
- Barā', 65
- al-Barā'a, sūra, 90-1
- Barthélemy d'Herbelot, 362
- Basetti-Sani, 11
- basmala, as sūra separator, 115
- Baṣra (city), 91
- Bathsheba, 256, 267
- baṭil (muḥaddithīn term), 238
- battles, 31
- Bayt al-Qarāṭīs, 204
- Bellamy, James, 7, 350
- Benhadad, 259
- Benjamin, 252
- Bergsträsser, G., 8, 87, 244, 335
- Beth-Shemesh, 267
- Bi'r Maʿūna, 68
- Bible
  - 200,000 variants found in, 335
  - authorship of the gospels, 314-5
  - as basis for Orientalist study of Arabic, 123
  - biblical scholarship compared to Islamic, 245
  - compared with the Qur'ān, 56
  - contemporary corruption of the text, 325-7
  - Contemporary English Version of, 325
  - doctrines and corruption, 328-30
  - edited during Hellenistic period, 269
  - Erasmus Bible, 323-324
  - examples of deliberate corruption of, 292-7
  - history according to modern scholars, 268-9
  - inspiration, 315-6
  - Leningrad Codex, 276-7
  - loss and rediscovery of Torah, 266-7
  - loss of the original gospel, 69
  - Masoretic texts, 275-7
  - oldest dated manuscript, xviii-xix
  - references to Prophet Muḥammad, 298
  - study of, compared with study of Qur'ān, 199
  - translations, 325-6
  - Tyndale Bible, 142-3
  - *See also* New Testament; Old Testament; Gospels
- Bilāl bin Rabāḥ, 87, 89
- Bilhah, 252
- Bin Sira, 272
- Bishr bin Ḥusain, 211
- Blachère, R., 87, 199, 245, 341-2
- Black Stone, 24
- Blau, 128
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph, 325
- Bobzin, Hartmut, 351
- books, preserving from adulteration, 216-1
- Booth, holiday of, 266
- Bosworth, C. E., xx
- boycott of the Muslims, Quraish, 28-9
- Bright, John, 353
- Bucaille, Maurice, 303, 315, 328
- al-Bukhārī, Muḥammad bin Ismāʿīl, 215
- Byzantine text, NT text type, 317

C

- Caesarean text, NT text type, 317
- Calder, N., 9
- Canaan, 250, 255, 296-7
- Canaanite, 271
- Cantineau, J., 127-9
- carbon dating, 175, 181, 290
- certificates of reading, 222-7
- chain of authority, 194, 197. *See also* isnād system
- Chester Beatty, 120
- Chiesa, Bruno, 284
- child sacrifice, 260-1
- Ching-hsing chi, 41

- Christian Arabic manuscripts, 124
- Christianity
  - atonement, 330
  - attempts to evangelize pre-Islamic Arabia, 22-3
  - authorship of the gospels, 314-5
  - cleansed of anti-Semitic references, xx
  - compared to Islam, 43, 56
  - creeds, 307-309
  - disciples of Jesus, 305-6
  - doctrines and corruption of the Bible, 328-30
  - early and later creeds compared, 307-9
  - early practices and beliefs, 310
  - Hellenistic influence on doctrine, 329
  - influence of sects on the NT, 323
  - interpolations into texts, 219-20
  - life of Jesus from secondary sources, 302-4
  - message of repentance, 306-9
  - persecution of early Christians, 309
  - secularization, 10
  - the term 'Christian', its meaning, 309
  - *See also* Bible; New Testament
- Chronicle of Fredegar, 40
- Chronicle of Khuzistan, 40
- classification of ḥadīth narrators, 213-5
- Clinton, Bill, 374
- code of Hammurabi, 273
- coinage, 139
- colonialism, 8, 363-365
- Comfort, P. W., 315-6, 322, 330
- Comma Johanneum, 318, 323-4, 328
- Companions
  - arrangement of the Qur'ān, 78
  - considered possessed of ʿadl, 215
  - dedication of, 42
  - development of isnād system, 205-9
  - ḥuffaẓ, 68-9
  - as teachers of the Qur'ān, 66-7, 68-9
- compilation of Qur'ān
  - as a community effort, 89, 240
  - during reign of Abū Bakr, 84-7
  - importance of personal testimony in, 240
  - justification for, 83
  - lack of certainty in isolated reports, 240-1
  - methodology of, 87-91
  - Orientalist criticism of, 336-7
  - ṣuḥuf, 91
  - ʿUthmān's recompilation, 96-106
- conquest of Makkah, 33-5
- Constantine (Roman emperor), 310
- Contemporary English Version of the Bible, 324
- Cook, Michael, 6-7, 10-11
- copyist errors, 189, 219
- Corpus Coranicum project, 244-5
- Coulson, N. J., 364
- Council of Jamnia, 278
- Cragg, Kenneth, 11, 350
- Crone, Patricia, 5-7, 9
- Cross, Frank, 279, 290
- Crucifixion, xx

D

- Daba (city), 36
- Dagobert, 40
- Ḍaif, Shauqī, 87, 102
- dam of Muʿāwiya, 137, 155
- Damascus document, 267
- Damascus, 37, 92
- Dan, 252
- Darb Zubayda caravan route, 137
- Dathan, 255
- Davey, Noel, 314
- David. *See* Dāwūd
- Davidson, B., 161-2
- Davies, Peter, 269
- Davila, J. R., 290
- Dāwūd (David), 17, 43, 256, 267
  - revisionist view of, 256
- Dead Sea Scrolls, 288-92
  - Damascus document, 267
  - dismissal of Strugnell, 354-5
  - secrecy surrounding, 355-6
- Delitzsch, Friedrich, 353-4
- Demsky, Aaron, 266
- Dever, William G., 269
- Dhakwān, 63
- Dhi'b, Muḥammad, 289

Dhul-Qaṣṣa (city), 35
diacritical marks
  invention of, 156-8
  sources of, 160-3
  in the Talmud, 284-6
  two schemes of, 159-60
dialects, 66
  aḥruf, 192
  disputes in recitation, 95-6
  ḥadīth of the seven dialects, 191
  See also multiple readings
Diem, 128
diffusion of ḥadīth compilations, 224-7
disciples of Jesus, 305-6
dissension, avoiding, 62
dittography, 189, 283
Docetism, 311
Dodd, C. H., 268-9
dotting schemes, 151-6, 189-97
Driver, Professor, 292
Dushtī, ʿAlī, 7

E
early Jewish script, 271-2
Edom, 295-6
education
  charging for, 59-60
  encouragement to learn, 59
  learning from non-Muslims, 60
  in Madinah, 65-6
  role of ʿUmar in spread of Qurʾān, 91-3
  seeking knowledge, 204
Egypt, 252-3
Egyptian Church Order, 308
Ehrman, Bart D., 189, 310
Elisha, 258
ʿEn ʿAvdat, inscription at, 126-7
endowments, confiscation of, 363
English
  division of into Old, Middle and Modern, 142
  phonetic irregularities in, 141
  variant spellings in, 142-3
entagion, 154
envy, when permissible, 61
Epistola Apostolorum, 307
equal status, concept of, 232
Erasmus Bible, 323-4
Esau, 250, 295-6
Esther, book of, 339
Estrangelo, 124
Ethiopia, 27, 63
Europe, 15, 362
European Science Foundation, 244
Euting, J., 123
exegetical commentary, 199-200
Exodus, 253
Ezra, 262

F
Fadak (city), 18
al-Faḍl bin Shadhān, 232
al-Falaq, sūra, 234-5
al-Fātiḥa, sūra, 234-5
Fāṭima bint al-Khaṭṭāb, 64, 71
Fāṭima, daughter of the Prophet, 54, 237
Fazlur-Raḥmān, 7
Festival of Shelters, 255
Fihr, tombstone of, 127
fiqh, influence of on the Talmud, 286-7
al-Firabrī, 220
Fischman, Dennis, 365
fitna
  in contemporary non-Muslim sources, 206
  loss of muṣḥaf of Madinah during, 167-8
  rise of the isnād system due to, 206
folklore, use of isnāds in, 228
al-Frāheedī, Khalīl bin Aḥmad, 158-9, 163, 285
Freud, Sigmund, 367
Frost, David, 366
al-Funaisān, Saʿūd, 165
Funk, Robert, 303

G
Gabriel. *See* Jibrīl
Gad, 252
Geiger, Abraham, 8
Genesis, 292-7
German, 142
gharīb ḥadīths, 215
al-Gassānī, Muḥammad bin ʿUbaid, 156

Ghassanid kingdom, 18
Ghifār (tribe), 191
Gibb, 364
glosses, 219
God. *See* Allāh
Gökalp, Ziya, 10
golden calf, 254
Goldziher, Ignace
  criticism of ḥadīth and isnād, 364
  on altering a word for its synonym, 199-200
  second phase of attack on Islam, 8
  theory of divergent readings, xxii, 123, 189, 193-7
Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe, 284
gospels
  ascension of Christ, 330
  authors of, 314-5
  comma Johanneum, 318, 323-4, 328
  difficulties of using as historical document, 302-4
  inspiration, 315-6
  loss of, 69
  oldest dated manuscripts, xviii-xix
  Q gospel, 311, 313-4, 329
Greek Orthodox Church, 318
Greek religion, 262
Greek scripts, 318-20
Gruendler, Beatrice, 123, 127-30, 139
Guardi brothers, 351
Guidi, 160
Guillaume, A., 341

H
Habakkuk, 253
ḥadīth
  applying principles of to Christian texts, 245
  authentication of, 209-5
  classification of narrators, 212-5
  development of isnād system, 205-8
  establishing authorship of compilations,220-1
  impact of on other sciences, 228
  meticulous documentation of, xix
  preserving ḥadīth books from adulteration, 216-1
  reading certificates, 222-7
  resolving contradictions, 214
  testing accuracy of narrators, 211-2
  transmission of compilations, 224-7
Ḥaḍramout, 36
al-Hafad, 238
Ḥafṣa bint ʿUmar
  duplication of ṣuḥuf of, 96
  entrusted with the ṣuḥuf, 93
  ṣuḥuf compared with ʿUthmān's compilation, 100-1
Hājar (Hagar), 16, 249-50, 292
al-Hajjāj bin Yūsuf al-Thaqafī
  accused of altering the Qurʾān, 106-8
  credited with compilation of Qurʾān, 347
  distribution of muṣḥafs, 108-9
  divisions of the Qurʾān, 109, 120-1
al-Ḥajrī, tombstone, 135-6
Ḥakīm bin Ḥizām, 34
al-Hamadanī, 238
Hamān, 338-9
Ḥamidullāh, M., 38
Ḥammād bin Salama, 211-12, 238
Hammurabi, code of, 273
al-Hamqatain (city), 36
Ḥamza bin ʿAbdul Muṭṭalib, 27
ha-Nasi, Rabbi Judah, 275, 286
Hāniʾ al-Barbarī, 98
haplography, 175, 189, 280
Haran, 251
al-Ḥārith bin al-Aʿwar, 62
al-Ḥārith bin Hishām, 48
harmonization, 323
Ḥarrān, 126, 133
Hārūn (Aaron), 254-5
Hārūn bin ʿUmar, 99
al-Ḥasan, 236
Ḥasan, ʿIzzat, 160, 165
Hāshim clan, boycott of, 28-9
Healy, J. F., 128
Hebrew, not original language of Torah, 270-3
Ḥejāzī script, xviii, 124, 196
  extant muṣḥafs in, 186-8
Hellenism, 329
Hellenistic rule of the Israelites, 262-3, 269

Heraclius, 40-1, 134
Hertzberg, 366-8
Hezekiah, 260
Hijāba (early Makkan institution), 21
Hilkia, 260
Hillel, 275
Ḥimṣ (city), 37, 92
Ḥīra (Kūfa), 18, 36
Ḥirā' (cave), 25
Hiraql (Heraclius), 40-1, 134
Hirschfeld, 340, 350
Hishām bin Ḥakīm, 65, 190
history, use of isnāds in, 228
homoioteleuton, 280-1
homosexuality, accusations against Jesus, 304-5
Hort, 335
Hoskyns, Edwyn, 314
Hoyland, R. G., 39
Ḥubba bint Hulail, 19
Ḥudaibiya peace treaty, 33
Ḥudaij bin Mu'āwiya, 110
Ḥudhaifa bin al-Yamān, 95-6, 105
Hudhaifa bin Miḥsin al-Ghalafānī, 36
Hudhail, dialect of, 95
ḥuffāẓ, 68-9
  preservation of the Qur'ān, 203, 337
  role in compilation of Qur'ān, 89
Ḥukūma (early Makkan institution), 21
Ḥulwān-un-nafr (early Makkan institution), 21
Humphreys, R. S., 6-7, 364, 368
Ḥunain bin Isḥāq, 161-3, 285
Hurgronje, Snouck, 8, 358-9
al-Ḥusain, 236
Ḥusain, Ṭaha, 7
hypocrites, 31

I

'Ikrima bin Abī Jahl, 36, 146
'Imāratul-bait (early Makkan institution), 21
'Īsā (Jesus)
  accusations of homosexuality and adultery, 304-5
  ascension, 330
  crucifixion, xx
  disciples of, 305-6
  establishing existence of, 301-5
  finite scope of message, 43
  idea of divinity of absent from Q gospel, 313-4, 329
  language of, 304
  life of, from secondary sources, 302-4
  message of repentance, 306-9
  non-Christian references to, 302
  witnesses of burial and resurrection, 245
i'lām (muḥaddithīn term), 216
Ibn 'Abbās. *See* 'Abdullāh bin 'Abbās
Ibn Abī an-Najūd, 191
Ibn Abī Dāwūd, 198
  discredited, 106-7
Ibn Abī Lailā, 112
Ibn Abī Shaiba, Muṣannaf of, 218
Ibn 'Āmir, qirā'at of, 188
Ibn 'Asākir, 97
Ibn al-Bawwāb, 120, 148
Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī
  committee for compilation of Qur'ān, 97
  grading of narrators into twelve categories, 212-3
  on Ibn Mas'ūd's Muṣḥaf, 237
  on Quraish dialect, 96
  on witnesses, 86
Ibn al-Ḥanafiya, 111
Ibn Ḥazm, 'Alī bin Sa'īd, 237
Ibn Isḥāq, 51
Ibn al-Jazarī, 188
Ibn Ma'īn, 206, 211-2
Ibn Māja, sunan of, 224-7
Ibn Mājishūn, 215
Ibn Mas'ūd. *See* 'Abdullāh bin Mas'ūd
Ibn Mas'ūd's Muṣḥaf
  alleged variations, 231-2
  analysis of contents, 236-7
  arrangement of, 232-3
  attribution of aberrant readings, 234
  lack of evidence of variations in, 198
  omitted sūras, 234-8
Ibn Miqsām, 243
Ibn al-Mubārak, 210
Ibn Mujāhid, 191, 194, 239

Ibn al-Musayyib, 111
Ibn Qudāma al-Maqdisī, 225-7
Ibn Qutaiba, 108
Ibn aṣ-Ṣabbāgh, 237
Ibn Shabba, 106, 109
Ibn Shanbūdh, 242
Ibn Sīrīn, 13, 97, 162, 206, 373
Ibn Ṭariq, 225
Ibn Um Maktūm, 48, 49, 64
Ibn Ushta, 99, 130, 158
Ibn 'Uyayna, 236
Ibn Wahb, 215, 222
Ibn Zabāla, 109
Ibn az-Zubair. *See* 'Abdullāh bin az-Zubair
Ibrāhīm (Abraham)
  and Makkah, 16-19
  biblical account, 249-50
  building of the Ka'ba, 17
  corruption of OT texts concerning, 292-7
  prayer of, 46
  prophethood, 43
  sacrifice of Ismā'īl, 17
Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'ī, 110-1, 166
idolatry, among the Israelites, 257-61
Ifāda (early Makkan institution), 21
Ijāza (early Makkan institution), 21
Ijāza (muḥaddithīn term), 216
Imamate, 60-61, 242
impartiality, 359-62
Imru' al-Kais, 126, 128, 129
Indonesia, 358
inheritance, 85
inspiration, 315-6
Institute of Oriental Studies, St. Petersburg, 172
  muṣḥaf of 'Uthmān at, 180-2, 185-6, 347-8
instructions of 'Uthmān, 104-6
interpolations, 219-20
Iqlaimis, Yūsuf Dāwūd, 161
Iraq, 36, 106
irregularities in non-Qur'ānic script, 163-5
Isḥāq, 43, 249-50
Ishmael. *See* Ismā'īl
Islam
  bias of modern Orientalist studies, 361-2
  compared to Christianity and Judaism, 43, 56
  influence on Judaism, 284-7
  perverted view of, 361
  revisionism, 3-9, 359
  secularization, 10
  studied with Western terminology, 245-6. 337-8
Islamic inscriptions
  dam of Mu'āwiya near Ṭā'if, 137, 155-6
  dam of Mu'āwiya at Wādī al-Ḥanaq, 155
  at Darb Zubayda, 137
  earliest dated, 136
  at Jabal Sala', 133
  near Makkah based on verses, 138
  tombstone from Aswān, 136
  tombstone from Ḥalḥūl, 137
  verse near Makkah, 137-8
  at Wādī Sabeel, 154
Islamic world
  Chinese appraisal of, 41
  contemporary non-Muslim references to, 39-41
  perceived threat of, 361
  rapid military gains of, 36-8
  revisionism, 7-9, 39
  spread into Persia, 37-8
Ismā'īl (Ishmael)
  biblical account, 249-50
  birth of, 16
  language of, 129-30
  prophethood, 43
  sacrifice, 17
  textual corruption concerning, 292-7
Ismā'īl al-Qusṭ, 158
isnād system
  authentication of isnāds, 209-15
  development of, 205-8
  extended to protect books of scholars, 216-21
  for qirā'at, 239
  impact of on other sciences, 228
  in transmission of Qur'ān, 194, 228-9

  personal contact, 204-5
  proliferation of ḥadīth, 205-9
  quoting, when adding additional material, 219
  rejected by Orientalists, 197
  resolving contradictory ḥadīths, 214
  testing accuracy of narrators, 211-2
  unbroken chain, 213
isolated reports,
  lack of certainty in, 240-1
  cannot supersede ʿUthmān's Mushaf, 242
Isrāʾ. *See* nocturnal journey
Israel, 249
  as concept of fantasy, 270
  kings of, 257-8
  languages of, 270-3
  as motivation for Orientalism, 367-70
  suppression of Palestinian history, 357-8
  third phase of attack on Islam, 8-9
Israelites. *See* Jews
Issachar, 252
Itture Sopherim, 281-2
Iyās bin Muʿādh, 64

J

Jabal Asīs, 132
Jabal Ramm, 131-2, 152
Jabal Salaʿ, 133
Jābir bin ʿAbdullāh, 67
Jacob. *See* Yaʿqūb
Jacob of Raha, 161-2
al-Jāḥiz, 228
Jahoshaphat, 259
Jāmiʿ of Ibn Wahb, 215, 222
Jamnia, Council of, 278
al-Jarḥ wa at-Taʿdīl, 213
Jeffrey, Arthur
  acknowledgement of integrity of the Qurʿānic text, 243
  alleged variations from Ibn Masʿūd, 231
  attribution of aberrant readings to Ibn Masʿūd, 234
  disregard of isnād system, 197-8
  historical works on Qurʾān, 336
  on multiple readings of Qurʾān, 193-7
  reference to sources without isnād, 197, 231
  second phase of attack on Islam, 6
  use of biblical terminology, 245
Jehoahaz, 261
Jehoram, 259
Jehu, 258
Jericho, 255
Jeroboam, 257
Jerusalem, 262
Jesus. *See* ʿĪsā
Jews
  after the Inquisition, 365-6
  the Ark, 255
  Babylon, 261
  child sacrifice, 259-61
  compared with the Companions, 42
  disparaging remarks removed from Bible, 325-7
  early history, 249-55
  early Jewish script, 271-2
  establishment in Madinah, 18
  golden calf, 254
  Hellenistic rule, 261-3
  idolatry among, 258-61
  Jewish scholars, 355-7
  kingdom of, 256-63
  kings of Israel, 257-8
  kings of Judah, 259-61
  languages of, 270-1
  modernity, 367
  promiscuity among, 258-61
  schemes for liberation of, 366-7
  taking of Egyptian jewels, 253
  treachery, 250-1
  views on ʿĪsā (Jesus), xx
  See also Judaism; Old Testament
Jibrīl (Gabriel), 49-50, 54-5, 74, 85, 191, 237
jihād, 375
John of Damascus, 8
Jordan River, 255
Joseph. *See* Yūsuf
Josephus, 250, 272, 295, 302
Joshua, 255, 267
Josiah, 260, 267
Judah, 252, 259-61

Judaism
  altering texts for doctrinal reasons, 281-2
  compared to Islam, 43
  influence of Islam, 284-7
  interpolations into texts, 220
  oral law, 273-5
  corruption of sacred texts, 292-7
  reforms, 259
  See also Jews; Old Testament
Judas Maccabee, 262
Jumʿa, Ibrāhīm, 125, 160
Jurhum (tribe), 16, 129
Juster, 302
juzʾ of Qurʾān, 121

K

Kaʿba
  building of, 17
  custody of, 21
  rebuilding of, 24
kalima shahāda, xxi
Kannengiesser, 315
Karabacek, J., 123
Karaite movement, 286
Kathīr bin Aflaḥ, 97
al-Kattānī, 72
Katzman, Avi, 354-5
Kerygma, 301
Khabbāb bin al-Aratt, 64, 71
Khadījah bint Khuwaylid, 24, 50
Khaibar (city), 18
al-Khalāʿ, 238
Khālid bin ʿAmr bin ʿUthmān, 109
Khālid bin Iyās, 102, 167
Khālid bin Saʿīd bin al-ʿĀṣ, 36-7, 72, 144
Khālid bin Walīd, 36-37
Khālid bin Yazīd bin Muʿāwiya, 112
Khalīfa bin Khayyāṭ, 228
Khālid al-Hadhdhāʾ, 162
Khalīl an-Nāmī, Y., 123
Khān, Isḥāq, 224
al-Khaṭṭābī, 83
Khazraj (tribe), 18, 31
Khirbet Qumran, 288
Khoury, Raif G., 163
Khubaib bin ʿAdī al-Anṣārī, 33
Khuzāʿa (tribe), 33
Khuzaima bin Thābit al-Anṣārī, 101
Khuzistan, 40-1
Kilpatrick, George D., 318
Kinda (tribe), 19
kitāb al-Ashriba, 220-1
Kitāb of Ibn Mājishūn, 215
kitāba (muḥaddithīn term), 216
Kittel, Rudolf, 276
knowledge
  encouragement to seek, 59, 204
  enormity of concealing, 59
  journeying in search of, 206
  learning and teaching the Qurʾān, 60-63
  See also education
Koester, Helmut, 307
Kohath, 252
Korah, 255
Koren, J., 369
Kūfa (city), 18, 92
Kūfic script, 123, 135-9, 196
  origins of, 135
Kung, Hans, 350

L

Laban, 251
Lakhm (tribe), 18
Lambton, 7
languages, 141-4
  colonialism, 363-5
  of the Israelites, 270-3
Latin, 142
law, use of isnāds in, 228
Leah, 251-2
Lebedev, V., 277
Lemche, Niels Peter, 269
Leningrad Codex, 276-7
Lester, Toby, xvii, 3-7, 11, 345, 374
letters of the Prophet Muḥammad, 133-4
Levi, 252, 266
Levy, M. A., 123
libraries, 112
linguistic analysis of sacred texts, 9-10
literature, use of isnāds in, 228
Littmann, 127
Liwāʾ (early Makkan institution), 21
Lucian of Antioch, 317

Luke, 314, 316
Luling, Gunter, 7
Lull, Raymond, 8
Lunn, Arnold, 305
Luther, Martin, 8, 305

M
Maacah, 259
Maccabaean dynasty, 262
Madā'in Ṣāleḥ (city), 128
Madinah
  constitution of, 31
  Cragg's recommendation to abandon verses revealed in, 350
  Masjid of Banī Zuraiq, 65
  migration to, 30-32
  Muṣʿab bin ʿUmair, 64
  pledge of ʿĀqabah, 29-30
  pre-Islamic Madinah, 18
  Qur'ānic education in, 65-6, 204
Mahara, 36
al-Mahdī (Abbasid ruler), 109
Maimonidies, 287
Maimūn al-Aqran, 158
Makkah
  building of the Kaʿba, 17
  cheifhood of ʿAbdul-Muṭṭalib, 22
  conquest of, 33-5
  early institutions, 21
  and Ibrāhīm, 16-19
  spread of Qur'ān in, 63-5
  as tribal society, 20-1
  recordings of Qur'ān in, 71-2
Mālik bin Abī ʿĀmir
  compilation of Qur'ān, 97-8
  muṣḥaf of, 170-2
  sūra separator, 115
Mālik bin Anas, 170
Mālik bin Dinār, 146
Mālik, Imām, 148, 215, 218, 228
Manasseh, 260, 274
manāzil of Qur'ān, 120
mankind, purpose of, 45
manuscripts
  concept of equal status, 232
  conditions for using, 219
  early Christian Arabic manuscripts, 124
  establishing authorship, 220-1
  first century Qur'ānic, 348-9
  gradations, 87-9
  handling variations in, 170
  interpolations, 219-20
  Nuskhat Abū az-Zubair, 211
  oldest dated Bible, xviii-xix
  rarity of Greek NT manuscripts, 319-20
  reading certificates, 222-7
Marcosian creed, 307
Margoliouth, D. S., 200
Mark, 314, 316
Marr aẓ-Ẓahrān (city), 34
Marraci, Luther, 8
Martyr, Justin, 315
Marx, Karl, xxi, 265, 365-7
Mary, the blessed Virgin, 301
al-Mashhad al-Ḥusainī, muṣḥaf of ʿUthmān at, 172, 179-80, 185-6
Mashūra (early Makkan institution), 21
Masjid of Banī Zuraiq, 65
al-Maṣrī, Amīn, 364
Masorah, 274-5, 283-4, 285-6
Masrūq, 111, 238
Massoretic text, 265
Mathew, 314, 316
Mattaniah, 261
McKenzie, S. L., 256
memorization of the Qur'ān, 56, 61-2, 68-9, 89, 203
Metzger, Bruce M., 189
Milik, J. T., 288, 291
Mingana, A
  distortion of Qur'ān, 342-5
  historical works on Qur'ān, 335
  inclination towards aberrant opinions, 243
  on date of compilation of Qur'ān, 347
  refutation of claims made by, 160-3
  theory on Arabic alphabet, 123-4, 131-4, 160-3
  theory on Qur'ān, 55
  on transmission of ḥadīth, 224
Minor Prophets scroll, 288, 291
minuscule script, 320
al-Miqdād bin ʿAmr, 32

miracles of the Qur'ān, 49
miʿrāj. *See* nocturnal journey
Miriam, 254
Mishna, 263, 273-5
  Islamic influence, 286-7
al-Mizzī, Jamāl ad-Dīn, 214
modernity, 367
Mohammedans, mislabeling of Muslims as, 130, 373
Molech, 261
Montefiore, Cannon Hugh, 304
morality
  as condition for narrating ḥadīth, 209
  as condition for teaching, 209, 229
Morozov, N. A., 4, 7
Moses. *See* Mūsā
Moubarac, Youakim, 11
Mount Gerizim, 279
Muʿādh bin Jabal, 67, 92
Muʿārada, 55
al-Muʿarrij as-Sadūsī, 97
Muʿāwiya bin Abī Sufyān, 107, 155, 157
  dam of, 137, 155
muḍṭarib (muḥaddithīn term), 214
al-Mughīra bin Shihāb, 103
al-Mughīra bin Shuʿba, 85
al-Mughnī, 225
al-Muḥabbar, 219
muḥaddithīn
  applying principles of to Christian texts, 245
  first generations of scholars, 215
  methodologies of ḥadīth authentication, 209-15
  reading certificates, 222-7
  use of isnād technique to preserve books, 216-21
Muhājir bin Abī Umayya, 36
Muḥammad. *See* Prophet Muḥammad
Muḥammad bin Maslama, 85
Muḥil, 110
Muḥriz bin Thābit, 108, 109
Muir, Sir William, 3-4, 7, 22, 347
Mujāhid, 112
multiple readings
  altering a word for its synonym, 199-200
  Goldziher's theory, 189
  ḥadīth of the seven dialects, 191
  Orientalist theory of divergent readings, 193-7
  reason for existence of, 191-2
  in ʿUthmān's dispatched muṣḥafs, 167-70, 188
munāwala, 216
al-Mundhir bin Sāwā, letter to, 133-4
al-Munaggid, S., 110, 160
Münster Institute of the New Testament Textual Research, 349
Muṣʿab bin ʿUmair, 64
Muṣʿab bin Saʿd, 103
Mūsā (Moses), 252-5
  lack of chain of transmission from, 274
  miracles, 49
Torah delivered to Levites, 266
Mūsā al-Asadī, 111
Mūsā bin Ismāʿīl, 211-2
Musailama al-Kadhdhāb, 35-6
Muṣḥafs
  of ʿAlī bin Abī Ṭālib, 145
  amending errors, 104-6
  arrangement of sūras in partial Muṣḥafs, 80-1
  attributed to ʿUthmān, 112, 172-86
  āyah separators, 116-120
  of Baṣra, 168-9, 171-2, 178, 186
  burning of fragments, 103
  copies made by ʿUthmān, 102
  dating Kūfic muṣḥafs, 135-9
  determining whether a verse is Qur'ānic, 239-43
  diacritical marks, 156-8
  divisions of the Qur'ān, 109-10
  dotting schemes, 151-6
  first century manuscripts, 348-9
  al-Hajjāj's distribution of, 108
  in Ḥejāzī script, 186-8
  of Ibn al-Bawwāb, 147-8
  at the Institute of Oriental Studies, St. Petersburg, 180-2, 185-6, 347-8
  instructions of ʿUthmān, 104-6
  introduction of, 91
  of Kūfa, 168-9, 180, 186

  limit of what is allowable within text of, 241-2
  of Madinah, 167-9, 171-2, 177, 185-6
  of Makkah, 168-9, 186
  of Mālik bin Abī ʿĀmir, 115, 170-2
  multiple readings in official copies, 168-170, 188, 192-3
  orthography in ʿUthmān's muṣḥaf, 144-9
  parchments from Yemeni collection, 79
  partial Muṣḥafs, 78-81
  personal Muṣḥafs, 231
  private copies, 172
  of Samarqand. *See* muṣḥaf of Tashkent
  of Sanʿāʾ, 118, 158-9
  of Shām (Syria), 168-9, 184, 188
  spelling conventions, 98
  studies on ʿUthmān's muṣḥaf, 167-170
  sūra separators, 115-6
  at al-Mashhad al-Ḥusainī (Cairo), 112, 179-80, 185-6
  of Tashkent, 117, 173-176, 182
  at Topkapi Saray, 112, 176-7, 185-6
  at Türk ve Islâm Eserleri Müzesi, 177-8, 185-6
  trade in, 110-12
  ʿUthmān's independent copy of, 97-101
  in ʿUthmān's personal possession, 167-9
  with irregular arrangement of sūras, 77-78
  See also Ibn Masʿūd's Muṣḥaf; manuscripts
Muslim bin Mishkam, 229
Muslim state, stability of, 201
Muslims, mislabeled as Mohammedans, 130, 373
Musnad of Ibn Ḥanbal, 215
mutābaʿa (muḥaddithīn term), 213
Muṭṭalib clan, boycott of, 28-29
Muwaṭṭaʾ of Mālik, 215, 218, 228
Muwaṭṭaʾ of Shaibānī, 215

N
Nabaṭ bin Ismāʿīl, 130
Nabatean script, 123, 125
  compared with Arabic, 126-9
  language of the Nabateans, 129-31
nabīdh, 210
Nadab, 258
an-Nadīm, Muḥammad, 232, 235, 242
Nadwa (early Makkan institution), 21
Nāfiʿ bin Abī Nuʿaim, 144
Nāfiʿ bin Zuraib, 97
Najiya bin Rumḥ, 108
Namārah, 126, 129
Naphtali, 252
narrators of ḥadīth
  classification of, 212-5
  determining trustworthiness of, 209-11
  journeying in search of knowledge, 206
an-Nās, sūra, 234-5
Nasīʾ (early Makkan institution), 21
Naṣr bin ʿĀsim, 158
nation-state, 20, 270
an-Nawawī, Muḥyiddīn Yaḥyā, 237
Nebajoth bin Ismāʿīl, 130
Nebuchadnezzar, king, 261
Negev (desert), 369
Neusner, J., 263, 284
Neuwirth, Angelika, 244
Nevo, Yehuda, 7, 39, 369-70
New Kingdom period, 339
New Testament
  authorship of the gospels, 314-5
  contemporary corruption of the text, 325-7
  deliberate corruption of, 310-11
  difficulties of using as historical document, 302-3
  disciples of Jesus, 305-6
  divergences within the text of, 317-8
  doctrines and corruption, 328-30
  episodes of poor discipleship in, 305
  Erasmus Bible, 323-4
  inspiration, 315-6
  oldest dated manuscripts, xviii-xix
  rarity of Greek manuscripts, 318-20
  recensions, 318

  references to Prophet Muḥammad, 298
  scribal alterations, 322-3
  scribal interpolations, 317
  study of, compared with study of Qurʾān, 199
  text types (Alexandrian, Byzantine, Caesarean, Western), 317-8
  textual corruption, 318-23
  transmission of, 316-7
  Westcott and Hort and the number of variants therein, 335
  See also Christianity; Bible
Newman, Barclay, 325-6
Nicene creed, 308
an-Nisāʾī, sunan of, 218
Nisibis, 162
nocturnal journey (Isrāʾ and Miʿrāj), 26
Nöldeke, Theodor, 8, 55, 123, 338-9
non-Muslims, learning from, 60
North Arabic script, 124
Norton, Cherry, 56
Nuʿaim bin ʿAbdullāh, 71
Nūḥ (Noah), 43
Nuskhat Abū az-Zubair, 210-11

O
O'Conner, 128
Old Creed of Alexandria, 307
Old Testament
  consensus on the book of Esther, 339
  destruction of old manuscripts, 282-3
  discrepancies between Samaritan and Jewish versions, 279-80
  edited during Hellenistic period, 269
  examples of deliberate corruption of, 292-7
  gross overestimates of number of Israelites, 253
  history according to modern scholars, 268-9
  history of, 265-9
  Jewish sources of the Torah, 272
  lack of authoritative text, 282
  Leningrad Codex, 276-7
  loss and rediscovery of Torah, 266-7
  Masoretic texts, 275-7
  non-Jewish sources of the Torah, 273
  oral transmission of, xviii
  original language of, 270-1
  references to Prophet Muḥammad, 298
  search for an authoritative text, 277-84
  study of, compared with study of Qurʾān, 199
  unintentional corruption, 280-1
  variations, 278-9
  See also Judaism; Bible
Onias III, 262
oral law of Judaism, 273-5
oral transmission of Qurʾān, xvii-xviii, 103-4, 165
Orientalism
  accusations of appropriation from Jewish sources, 338-9
  acknowledgement of integrity of the Qurʾānic text, 243
  attempt at a critical edition of the Qurʾān, 244-5
  bias, 359-62
  Blachère's distortion of Qurʾān, 341-2
  criticism of compilation of Qurʾān, 336-7
  disregard for Muslim scholarship, 201
  Hurgronje, Snouck, 358-9
  Israel as motivation of, 367-9
  Jewish analogue, 353-7
  motives for study, 363-9
  necessity of proving distortions in Qurʾān, 335
  Sanʿāʾ fragments, 149-50, 345-50
  synonym theory, 199-200
  theories on divergent readings, 193-7
  theories on Qurʾān, 55
  theory of counterfeited Bible, 340-1
  use of aberrant narrations, 197-9
  use of biblical terminology in Islamic studies, 246, 337-8

Origen, 323
original sin, 330
orthography
  divergence, 239-42
  of European languages, 141-4
  history of the Arabic characters, 123-6
  in non-Qurʾānic script, 163-5
  writing styles at the time of the Prophet, 144
Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, 152, 154

P

paid copyists, 111
palaeography, 123, 151-6
  in non-Qurʾānic script, 163-5
  See also orthography
paleo-Hebrew, 270
Palestine
  spread of Qurʾān to, 91
  suppression of history, 357-8
Palestinian Talmud, 286
palimpsest, 344
partial Muṣḥafs, 78-81
pen names, 203
Pentateuch, 269, 279-80
Peres, Shimon, 366
persecution of early Christians, 309-10
Persians, 36, 269
personal Muṣḥafs, 231
Peter the disciple, 305
Peter the Venerable, 8, 362
Pharaoh, 253
Pharisees, 278
Pharos, 16
Philistines, Ark lost to, 267
Phoenician alphabet, 123
Pissareff, S., re-inking of Tashkent muṣḥaf, 112, 173
plagues of Egypt, 253
pledge of ʿAqaba, 29-30
pointing, 284-5
politicized Islam, 350
polytheists, effects of the Qurʾān on, 50-2
Power, 9
prayer
  as means of preservation of Qurʾān, 240
  Imamate, 60-61
  order of verses, 77
pre-Islamic era
  Arab religion, 22-23
  development of the Arabic script, 123-6
  early Arabic alphabet, 131-4
  Madinah (Yathrib), 18
  Nabatean as dialect of Arabic, 126-31
  use of skeletal dots, 151-3
Presbyters, 307
Pretzl, O., 336
private copies of the Qurʾān, 172
promiscuity among the Israelites, 257-61
proofreading of the Qurʾān, 73, 111
Prophet Muḥammad (f)
  accusations of sorcery, 52
  the amīn, 24
  arrangement of the Qurʾān, 74-5
  assassination attempt, 30
  battles of, 32-3
  birth of, 24
  death of, 35-6
  final messenger, 46-7
  first revelation, 25
  letters of, 133-4
  in Madinah, 30-32
  marriage to Khadījah, 24
  migration to Madinah, 30
  miracles preceding his prophethood, 25
  preaching openly, 26-7
  references to in the Bible, 298
  roles regarding the Qurʾān, 52-4
  states during revelation, 48-9
  as teacher of the Qurʾān, 63-4
  temptations offered by the Quraish, 27-8
  universality of, 43
prophethood, 43
  prophets are sinless, xxii-xxiii
  message of the prophets, 45-6
public libraries, 112
Puin, G.-R. Joseph, 4-7, 11-2, 149-50, 345-50

Q

Q gospel, 310-11, 313-4, 329
Qaʿ al-Muʿtadil, inscription at, 136
qāriʾ, 103, 233
Qaṭar, 40
qirāʾat
  as sunna, 190-92
  and al-Ḥajjaj, 108
  inaccuracies in, 240
  isnāds for, 239
Qiyāda (early Makkan institution), 21
Qubba (early Makkan institution), 21
Quḍāʿa (tribe), 36
Qumran, 282, 288-92
Qurʾān
  altering a word for its synonym, 199-200
  and anti-Semitism, 371
  arrangement of verse and sūras, 73-81
  assault against, 374-5
  attempts to reduce to a cultural text, 9
  avoiding dissension through, 62
  calls for reinterpretation of, 11
  compared with the Bible, 56-7
  deliberate Orientalist distortions of, 341-7
  determining whether a verse belongs to, 239-43
  dialects, 66
  disputes in recitation, 95-6
  education of, 63-7
  effects on the polytheists, 50-2
  enormity of forgetting, 62
  first century manuscripts, 348-9
  first revelation, 25, 49-50
  ḥuffāẓ, 68-69
  learning and teaching, 60-62
  limit of what is allowable within text of, 241-2
  merit of merely listening to, 61
  oral transmission, 103-4, 165
  Orientalist attempts at a critical edition of, 244-5
  Orientalist theories on, 55
  preservation of, 53, 83
  proofreading of, 73,111
  recitation with Jibrīl, 54-55
  revelation of, 47-49
  revisionism, 3-9
  searches for ulterior sources, 8
  substituting with translations, 10
  theory of counterfeited Bible, 340
  written recordings of, 71-2, 89-90
  See also compilation of Qurʾān; muṣḥafs; multiple readings; ṣuḥuf; manuscripts; Sanʿāʾ; recitation of Qurʾān; sūras; ʿUthmān's Muṣḥaf; Zaid bin Thābit
Quraish
  boycott of Muslims, 28-9
  dialect of, 95-6
  Quṣayy, 19-21
al-Quraẓī, 232
Quṣayy, 19-21
Quzuʿah (tribe), 36

R

Rabbi Akiba, 283-4
Rabbi Judah ha-Nasi, 286
Rachel, 251-2
Rafāda (early Makkan institution), 21, 22
Rāfiʿ bin Mālik al-Anṣārī, 64, 72
Raqūsh tombstone, 128, 152
Ras Shamra, 273
Raza Library Collection, 145
Razīn bin Anas as-Sulamī, 144
reading certificates, 222-7
Rebekah, 250-52
recensions of the New Testament, 318
recitation of Qurʾān
  disputes in, 95, 96
  with exegetical commentary, 199-200
  Orientalist synonym theory, 199-200
  as prophetic role, 52-4
  as sunna, 190-1
reciters, 103-4
  the seven most distinguished, 233
  use of the isnād system, 228
Reeland, Adrian, 359
Rehoboam, 257-9
Reimarus, Hermann, 303-306

religion, uprooting of, 367-8
resurrection of Jesus, 245
Reuben, 252
revelation
  first descent of, 24-5, 49-50
  of Qur'ān, 47-9
  Orientalist theories on, 55
  suitability of the Arabic language, 202
revisionism, 3-9, 39, 359
ar-riḥla, 206
Rippin, Andrew, 5, 9
Robert of Ketton, 8
Robson, J., 224
Roman empire
  conquest of Jerusalem, 262
  loss of Syria, 36
  persecution of early Christians, 309-10
Rowley, 268
Rustam, 41

S
Sa'd bin Abī Waqqāṣ, 26, 63
Sa'd bin Mu'ādh, 32
Sadāna (early Makkan institution), 21
Ṣafwān bin Umayya, 33
Ṣaḥāba. *See* Companions
Ṣaḥiḥ of al-Bukhārī, 215, 218
Sahl bin Sa'd al-Anṣārī, 67
Sa'īd bin al-'Āṣ, 97
Sa'īd bin Jubair, 111
Sa'īd bin Zaid, 64, 71
Said, Edward, xxi, 358, 361
Sa'īd, Yūsuf, 160
Sajāḥ bint al-Ḥārith bin Suwaid, 35, 36-7
Sakāka (city), 152
Salar Jung Museum, 78, 80-1
Ṣalāt. *See* prayer
Sālim bin 'Abdullāh, 111
Salmā bint 'Amr, 21
Saltykov-Shchedrin Library, 276
samā' (muḥaddithīn term), 216
Samaritans, 279-80
Samarqand, muṣḥaf of. *See* Tashkent, muṣḥaf of
Samuel, 256
as-Samhūdī, 109
Ṣan'ā'
  fragments, 4-6, 12, 345-9
  irregularities of alif in, 149-50
  muṣḥafs of, 118
  muṣḥafs showing diacritical marks, 158-9
Saracens, 39-40
Sārah (Sarah), 16, 249-50, 292-4
Sarawāt mountains, 15
Sassanid dynasty, 37
Sartre, Jean-Paul, 366
Saul, 256
Sauvaget, J., 87
Sawwār bin Shabīb, 99
Schacht, Joseph, 8, 307, 358, 364
scholars, 215
  conditions for using a book, 219
  ideological incompatibility, 357
schools. *See* education
Schuror, 302
scribes
  interpolating into texts, 219
  of the Qur'ān, 71-72
  writing styles, 144
Second Temple, 262
secularization, 11, 363-4
Seir, gods of, 260
Semites, 15-16
Seperationism, 311
Septuagint, 279
seven dialects, 191
seven reciters, 233
shādh (muḥaddithīn term), 213, 238
shahāda, xxi
Shaiba ibn Hāshim. *See* 'Abdul-Muṭṭalib
ash-Shaibānī, 238
Shaibānī, Muḥammad, 215
Shammai, 275
Shanks, H., 290, 355, 358
Shapham, 260
ash-Sharq al-Awsaṭ, 4
Shebunin, A., 173-4
Shechem, 279-80
Shiite Islam and the Qur'ān, 233-4
Shiloh, temple of, 255
Shuraḥbīl bin Ḥasana, 36
Shuraiḥ, 111
Shustar, 40
Sībawaih, 163
Sifārah (early Makkan institution), 21
Simeon, 252
Siqāya (early Makkan institution), 21, 22
Sīrat Ibn Isḥāq, 341-2
skeletal dots, 151-6
  lack of as basis of Orientalist theory, 189, 193-7
  sources of, 160-3
Smith, A., 335
Smith, G. R., 128
Smith, W. C., 11
Socialism, 366
Solomon. *See* Sulaimān
Son of God
  idea absent from Q gospel, 313-4, 329
  in Greek manuscripts, 320-2
Son of man, 321
Soviet scholars, 4
Spanish Inquisition, 365-6
spelling reform, 142
square script, 272
Starcky, J., 123
stone tablets, 254
Strack, H., 365
Strugnell, John, 354-5
Succeeding Successors, 215
Successors, 215
Ṣuffa, 65
Sufyān ath-Thawrī, 228
ṣuḥuf
  archival of, 91
  compared with 'Uthmān's compilation, 99-101
  compilation of, 91
  duplication of, 96
  entrusted to Ḥafṣa bint 'Umar, 93
Sulaim (tribe), 36
Sulaimān (Solomon), 17, 43, 256
as-Sulamī, 198, 238
Sumatra (major island in the Indonesian archipelago), 358
Sunan Ibn Māja, 224-7
sunna, 42
sūras
  basmala as separator, 115
  omitted sūras in Ibn Mas'ūd's Mushaf, 234-8
  separators in muṣḥaf of Mālik bin Abī 'Āmir, 172
  title as separator, 116
Suwaid bin Muqarrin, 36
Suwaid bin Sa'īd al-Ḥadathānī, 218
Sūwaid bin Ṣāmit, 64
as-Suyūṭī, Jalāludīn, 63, 209
Syal, Rajeev, 57
synonym theory, 199-200
Syria, 36, 92
Syriac script, 123-4, 160-3

T
aṭ-Ṭabarī, 341
Tabernacles, 266
tābi'īn, 215
Tacitus, 302
tafsīr literature,
  Western criticism of, 11
  use of isnāds in, 228
Tahāma, 36
Ṭāhir bin Muḥammad al-Maqdisī, 225
Ṭā'if (city), 18, 137
  dam of Mu'āwiya near, 137, 155-6
Taimā' (city), 18, 23
T'ai-tsung, 41
Ṭalḥa bin 'Ubaidullāh, 26, 63
Talmon, Shemaryahu, 279
Talmud, 263
  alteration of text, 273
  Islamic influence, 286-7
  opinion on 'Isā, xx
  pointing (vocalization), 284-5
See also Babylonian Talmud, Palestinian Talmud
Tamīm ad-Dārī, 375
T'ang dynasty, 41
Tashkent, muṣḥaf of, 112, 117, 172
  dating of, 174-5
  history of, 173
  re-inking by S. Pissareff, 112, 173
  scribal errors in, 175
tawātur, 90, 239-242
at-Tawba, sūra, 90-91

Ṭayy mountains, 18
Ṭayy (tribe), 18, 23
Temple of Solomon, 256
Ten Commandments forgotten, 57
terminus datum of Qumran, 289-92
Tha'liba (tribe), 18
Thaur (cave), 30
Theophilus, 161
Thomas the Presbyter, 39
thiqa (muḥaddithīn term), 209-12
Tiberian system, 285
Tiqqune Sopherim, 281-2
at-Tirmidhī, Sunan of, 218
Tisdall, 8, 335, 364
title of sūra, as separator, 116
tolerance, 10-11
Tolstov, 7
tombstone of al-Ḥajrī, 135-6
tombstone of Aswān, 136
tombstone of Fihr, 127
tombstone of Ḥalḥūl, 137
Topkapi Sarayi, 110, 172, 176
  muṣḥaf of 'Uthmān at, 112, 176-7, 185-6
Torah
  delivered to Levites, 266
  history according to modern scholars, 268-9
  Jewish sources of, 272
  loss and rediscovery of, 266-7
  See also Old Testament, Talmud; Judaism
trade in muṣḥafs, 110-2
translations of the Qur'ān, 10
transmission of ḥadīth compilations, 224-7
transposition, 189
tribal societies, 20-21
Trinity
  based on questionable verses, 328
  Comma Johanneum, 318, 323-4, 328
  contradicts oneness of God, 43
  in Greek manuscripts, 320-21
  idea of Son of God absent from Q gospel, 313, 329
  introduction into creed, 307-9
  as proof that the Qur'ān is not counterfeit, 340-1
trustworthiness of ḥadīth narrators, 209-11, 212
Ṭulaiḥa bin Khuwailid, 35-6
Ṭuraifa bin Ḥājiz, 36
Türk ve Islâm Eserleri Müzesi, 172, 349
  muṣḥaf of 'Uthmān at, 177-8, 185-6
Turkey
  attempts to replace the Qur'ān, 10
  shelter for Jews after the Inquisition, 365-6
Tyndale, William, 142-3, 243

U
'Ubāda bin aṣ-Ṣāmit, 59, 67, 92
'Ubaidullāh bin Ziyād, 147
Ubayy bin Ka'b
  among the authority reciters, 233
  in committee for compilation of Qur'ān, 97
  differences in recitation, 191
  ḥadīth of the seven dialects, 192
  muṣḥaf of, 77, 231, 237, 238
  on placement of verses, 75
  reciting Qur'ān to the Prophet, 54
  spelling conventions, 98
  as teacher of the Companions, 65-7
Ubulla (city), 36
Ulrich, Eugene, 356
'Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb
  compilation of Qur'ān, 84, 337
  conversion of, 71
  development of diacritical marks, 156
  differences in recitation, 191
  ḥadīth about the Qur'ān, 61
  ḥadīth used as proof for synonym theory, 199
  learnt directly from the Prophet, 65
  role in spread of Qur'ān, 91-3
  territory gained by, 37-8
  use of skeletal dots during reign of, 153
  use of the word 'adl, 209
'Umar bin Shabba, 99
Umayyad caliphate, 106
Umm al-Jimāl (city), 126
Um-Sa'īd bint Buzrug, 67

uncial script, 319
universalism, 11
'Uqāb (early Makkan institution), 21
'Uqba bin 'Āmir, 67
'Uqba bin Nāfi' al-Fihrī, 110
Uriah, 256
'Urwah bin Thābit, 37
Usaid bin Huḍair, 60
Usul al-Fiqh, 287
'Utba bin Rabī'a, 27-8, 63
'Uthman bin 'Affān
  among the authority reciters, 233
  arrangement of the Qur'ān, 78
  Bayt al-Qarāṭīs, 204
  conversion of, 63
  ḥadīth on learning the Qur'ān, 60
  how isnād system was introduced, 205
  independent copy of muṣḥaf, 96-106
  instructions concerning muṣḥafs, 104-6
  introduction of the muṣḥaf, 91-2
  muṣḥafs attributed to, 112
  oral transmission of Qur'ān, 165
  personal copy of muṣḥaf, 167-9
  resolving differences in recitation, 96
  territory gained by, 37-8
  See also 'Uthmān's Muṣḥaf
'Uthmān bin Abī al-'Āṣ, 66-75
'Uthmān bin Maẓ'ūn, 63
'Uthmān's Muṣḥaf
  deviating from, 242-3
  differences between dispatched copies, 168-70
  Orientalist theory of divergent readings, 193-7
  orthography of, 144-9
  status of, 231
  studies on, 167-170
  supersedes isolated or aberrant reports, 242
  use of basmala, 115
Uzziah, 260

V
Valerian (Roman emperor), 310
Van Buren, Mascall, 9
variant readings. *See* multiple readings
Vermes, Geza, 356
de Vogüé, M., 123
von Dobschutz, 302
vow of 'Abdul-Muṭṭalib, 22

W
Wabra bin Yuḥannās, 67
Wādī al-Ḥanaq, 155
Wādī Murabba'āt, 282, 288-92
Wādī Sabeel, inscription at, 154
al-Wāfī, 'Alī 'Abdul-Wāḥid, 160
waḥy. *See* revelation
al-Walīd bin al-Mughīra, 52
Wansbrough, xx, 6-7, 9, 337, 365, 369-70
al-Wāqidī, 65
waṣiyya (muḥaddithīn term), 216
Wensinck, A. J., xxi
Westcott, 335
Western text, NT text type, 317
Whitelam, Keith, 357-8
wijāda (muḥaddithīn term), 216
Wilfinson, I., 125, 160
witnesses
  chain of authority (isnāds), 197-8
  compilation of the Qur'ān, 337
  law of, 85-87
  personal contact, 204
worship, 43, 45
written verses, 89-90
  diacritical marks, 156-8
  dotting schemes, 151-6
  writing styles, 144
Würthwein, Ernst, 189, 272, 277-8, 283

Y
Ya'lā, 48
Ya'qūb (Jacob), 43, 250-52
Yaḥyā bin Abī Kathīr, 166
Yaḥyā bin Ya'mar, 158, 162
Yamāmah, 36, 84
number of Muslims martyred at, 84
Yarmūk, battle of, 40
Yathrib. *See* Madinah
Yazdgird III, 41
Yazīd al-Fārsī, 147
Yazīd bin 'Abdullāh bin Qusaiṭ, 92
Yazīd bin Abī Sufyān, 37, 92

Yemen
  muṣḥafs of Sanʿāʾ, 118, 158-9
  parchments from Yemeni collection, 78
  Sanʿāʾ fragments, 4-6, 12, 345-9
Yūsuf (Joseph), 43, 252

Z
Zabad (city), 126, 132
Zahn, 302
Zaid bin Thābit
  Abū Bakr's instructions to, 85-7
  among the authority reciters, 233
  arrangement of the Qurʾān, 75-8
  compilation of the Qurʾān, 83-4, 97-8
  credentials of, 85
  handling of variant readings, 170, 188, 241
  memorization of Qurʾān, 64
  methodology of compilation, 87-91
  on mode of revelation, 48
  as reciter, 103
  reciting Qurʾān to the Prophet, 54
  as scribe of the Prophet, 73
  on sunna of qirāʾat, 192
Zamzam, 16, 22
az-Zarakhshī, Badruddīn, 89
Zebulum, 252
Zeus, altars to, in Jerusalem, 262
Zilpah, 252
Zirr bin Ḥubaish, 236, 238
az-Zubair bin ʿAdī, 210-11
az-Zubair bin al-ʿAwwām, 26, 63
az-Zuhrī, 72
Zuraiq (tribe), 65